

A LETTER

FROM

HIS EXCELLENCY J. WATSON WEBB,

UNITED STATES ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER
PLENIPOTENTIARY IN BRAZIL,

TO

J. BRAMLEY-MOORE, Esq., M.P.

IN REPLY TO A STATEMENT IN THE "TIMES" NEWSPAPER

BY

HIS EXCELLENCY W. D. CHRISTIE.

[Printed for Private Circulation.]

A LETTER,

ETC. ETC.

Rio de Janeiro, June 20th, 1883.

To J. BRANLEY MOORE, Esq., M.P.

MY DEAR SIR,—In a hurried note by the *Parana*, I thanked you, in the name of every friend of truth, for the manly stand you have taken in and out of Parliament, in defence of the right, and for the fearlessness, which is characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon, with which you have sustained the cause of truth, frankness, and fair dealing. Entirely unknown to you, you yet clearly perceived in my communication to Earl Russell irresistible evidence that, in writing that despatch, I could be actuated but by one motive—viz., the vindication of an innocent party, whose sole offence consisted in his refusing to be dragged into the personal quarrel of his superior. And the correspondence accompanying the despatch, when analysed, furnishes conclusive evidence of the truth of my allegation, that there had been exhibited a reckless disregard of truth on the part of Mr. Christie, which is not characteristic of a gentleman, and certainly not commendable in the representative of the English nation.

One word in regard to the publicity given to my letter to Earl Russell. I desire to say, once for all, that so far from being a party to, or having any knowledge, or even suspicion of its publication, I did not know that it had been printed until weeks after it had been read here in an English paper; and even at this time I am in profound ignorance of the manner in which a copy was obtained for publication.

Do not misunderstand me, and suppose that I for a moment regret its publication; on the contrary, inasmuch as it was published without my knowledge or consent, and without my connivance, directly or indirectly, on my part, I rejoice that it was placed before the public. A copy of my letter to Earl Russell, together with the letters enclosed, was prepared under my direction, and circulated among the members of the Dip-

6-24-30
Gift Charles E. Moore

matic Corps at this Court, to which I appended, in my own handwriting, the "summary" annexed. I then addressed a general letter to the members of the Corps, requesting them to read the correspondence and summary, and return it to the party presenting it; with the privilege, however, of retaining it for the purpose of exhibiting it to Mr. Christie. And I have reason to believe that it was exhibited to him, and that he carefully read, or *had read to him*, every word of the document I send you, which, in addition to what I forwarded to Lord Russell, contains Mr. Christie's last letter to me, and the summary prepared for my colleagues. After reading, or listening to its contents, Mr. Christie applied to the Russian and Prussian Ministers to know whether my version of the affair at M. de Glinka's (which he, Christie, denied) was or was not correct. M. de Glinka, the Russian minister, informed me that they replied it was strictly and even verbally accurate; and therefore I added that declaration to my "summary," or rather commentary, upon the correspondence, as you will perceive upon turning to it. They subsequently wrote Mr. Christie letters in regard to the words which led to my rebuking him as I did, and these letters he published in the *Times*. Of these, more hereafter; but is it not strange that Mr. Christie should withhold what they said about my version of the affair, so absolutely crushing to him, and the truth of which he publicly denied, and declared he would prove false? This very material fact is suppressed; and Mr. Christie informs Earl Russell that he had not seen the correspondence so generally circulated, with a written permission for any friend to exhibit it to him, and in relation to the contents of which he not only spoke freely, but which he denounced as untrue, and threatened to prove its falsehood, and actually applied to the Russian and Prussian Ministers for a certificate to that effect. Let us in charity suppose, that when he wrote to Earl Russell, he denied having seen the correspondence only in a Pickwickian sense. Hearing it read, or having its contents minutely repeated to him from the document in hand, he probably did not consider *seeing* it!

But all this has nothing to do with the accuracy of my charge to Earl Russell, that up to the 7th of November last Mr. Christie had exhibited "a reckless disregard of truth which is not characteristic of a gentleman, and certainly not commendable in the representative of the English nation." Were I to content myself with rehearsing to you some twenty instances of most deliberate falsehood, which have since been related to me, and could I prove each and all of them, it would not relieve me from the odium of having been guilty of misrepresentation, by the use of slanderous language against a colleague, in which I assume

to speak of my own knowledge instead of the representations of others. I am bound, as a gentleman, to prove to you the truth of what I alleged, and if I fail to do so, I hope that, from your place in the Commons, you will recal every offensive expression which you used in reference to Mr. Christie, and deliberately apply them to me.

Mr. Christie has obtained *permission* from Earl Russell to use in his defence his own report to the Foreign Office. This is all right; but were I to abstain from using my report until I could apply for and receive a similar *permission* from Washington, this letter would reach you in October next instead of July. I therefore assume the responsibility, this being a personal matter, of doing precisely what Mr. Christie has done. I send you an extract from *my* report to our Foreign Office, long as it is, and which concerns myself only; and if it be true, then most assuredly Mr. Christie stands before his own Government and the House of Commons, to which he has appealed, as being even more reckless of the truth than I represented him to be in my letter to Lord Russell. But my letter to Earl Russell is not the only place in which I have assailed his veracity, and he well knows it. He knows that I appended to that letter, for circulation among the Diplomatic Corps, the "summary" to which I call your attention, and therein I distinctly make the same charge, and fasten it upon him by his own written statements.

Mr. Christie, in his letter to the *Times* newspaper, and his friends in the House of Commons, insinuate, do not charge, that I am not socially Mr. Christie's equal; to which you very properly respond,—“Gen. Webb holds the same rank [Envoy Extraordinary] at the Court of Brazil that Mr. Christie does.” But, says Mr. Christie, in his letter to the *Times*, “Gen. Webb is a General of Militia, and was for a long period editor of a New York newspaper, until he was appointed, in 1861, Minister in Brazil.” This is literally true, but intended by Mr. Christie to insinuate a *falsehood*, and therefore is characteristic. I was for ten years an officer of the United States' Army, and after leaving it was, from its commencement until 1861, the editor of the *New York Courier and Enquirer*, for very many years the leading press in the United States. I was commissioned as “General” by the President of the United States in 1849, when I was sent as Minister to Austria; and hence my title. Four years afterwards, “Gen. Webb” was appointed military “Engineer-in-Chief” of the State of New York, with the rank of Brigadier-General; but the title thus conferred was merely nominal, so far as I was concerned, as I already held the rank that appointment carried with it. Is it ground of censure that my native State could not confer upon me higher rank than the

President of the United States had already bestowed? Assuredly not; and Mr. Christie simply aimed to insinuate *falsely* that my rank was derived from the last—a State and therefore a militia appointment, of which I am justly proud, because it was conferred voluntarily, and without the slightest knowledge on my part of the intention of the Executive. In regard to my social position at home, if that be important to you, and my present official station be not sufficient proof of it, I need only say, inquire of Mr. Adams or any of my countrymen in London. I suppose even Mr. Christie will not consider it a bad lineage to claim a descent from Gloucestershire, and to show a family record containing every birth in our family from the time my great ancestor settled in Hartford in 1633 (thirteen years after the landing of the pilgrims) to the present day, and that I wear a seal bearing our coat-of-arms, which, probably, that ancestor took to America with him, and which, after examination, Strong-i'-the-Arm of Pall Mall stated to Sir William Drummond Stewart, in 1844, was unquestionably cut more than two hundred years previously! But possibly Mr. Christie supposes I lost caste by having been “for a long period editor of a newspaper.”

You, however, may think differently, notwithstanding the party abuse which every public man and leading editor must encounter in a country where the press is perfectly free. And so, most assuredly, thought some of your greatest and best men in England in 1853 and 1854, both of which years I spent in England, visiting and being hospitably entertained in houses where Mr. Christie, most probably, has never been admitted. When the late Marquis of Lansdowne, who called himself my friend, gave his official dinner at Lansdowne House to Sir Hamilton Seymour after his being sent away from St. Petersburg in 1854, and the publication of his very graphic descriptions of the Emperor Nicholas' pictures of the “Sick Man,” the gentlemen present, *not of the Cabinet*, were Lord Brougham and myself. It was the venerable Marquis of Lansdowne and Lord Clarendon who pointed out to me how much good I could do if I would, under my own signature, publish in the *Times* newspaper a letter calculated to demonstrate that the editor of that press had no data for his intimation, which had so greatly alarmed the mercantile community, that the United States would permit its citizens to embark in privateering, to the injury of English commerce; and on the 3rd October, 1853, I made the publication which I enclose, and for which the *Times* be-rated me soundly, because it was compelled by the Government to publish it, *volens volens*, as at least three distinguished members of the present Cabinet well know.

True, the *Times* editor reserved the right of abusing me if he

was compelled to publish all the truths I had written, which he was assured by the gentleman who handed him my letter he might do to his heart's content. I enclose you that letter, in which I very clearly pointed out what must sooner or later be the consequences of the course pursued by the *Times* and its co-labourers; and if you will read it carefully, you will perceive that the state of feeling which I predicted ten years ago, and to prevent which on both sides of the Atlantic I have laboured most zealously, publicly and privately, for a quarter of a century, has at length come to pass, and mainly through the instrumentality of the *London Times*. My letter is dated Fenton's Hotel, St. James's-street, September 29th, 1853; and yet if you will carefully peruse the passages marked, you will agree with me that it might with propriety be dated July, 1863, especially what follows after disposing of the apprehensions of what the *Times* called "Yankee pirates."

From the "London Times" of October 3rd, 1853.

"But it matters very little how ably the Governments of England and the United States may be represented at their respective Courts, or how ardently they who conduct the two Governments may desire peace, or how incalculably great the interests which demand it, so long as the press of the two countries is at war. Such a war, most unfortunately for the great interests of both countries, now exists; and permit me to say, in all seriousness, that not only the great commercial and pecuniary interests of both England and America demand that it shall cease, but it is equally demanded by the great cause of constitutional freedom, of which England is the only example and exponent in the Old World. King, Lords, and Commons govern England; but the free press of England, through the medium of public opinion, controls those who govern her. And the free and untrammelled press of England and America has it in its power to cement a union between the two countries, which will grow in strength until Canning's sentiment of 'the mother and the daughter a match in arms against the world,' shall become a practical reality. And in like manner the press may foster among the people of both nations a feeling of hostility and enmity which cannot fail to bring upon both, and upon constitutional freedom in this hemisphere, the most disastrous consequences. . . .

"I need not remind you, Sir, that in the war now existing between the free press of England and America—the only free press in the world—we of the United States are acting entirely upon the defensive. It is no war of our seeking; and, although we have occasionally 'carried the war into Africa,' it has always been in sorrow rather than in anger; and in the hope, that by compelling you to look at home, the mote in your brother's eye might be obscured by the beam too visible in your own. Descended from a common ancestry, pos-

reading a common literature, and speaking a common language—every American who visits England feels very much as must the descendants of the junior branches of one of your old families when revisiting the ancestral hearthstone; and when we bear in mind how inseparable are the pecuniary interests of the two people, I cannot resist the conviction, that feeling and interest combine to cement a union between England and America upon a basis so indissoluble, that the wise and the good of both lands stand ready to exclaim—‘Those whom God has joined together let no man put asunder.’ We all feel, that whatever England has to be proud of anterior to the seventeenth century, is our joint inheritance. Your fathers and ours were the same people; and, although you are in possession of the monuments of their power and civilisation, their fame is a common inheritance of which we cannot be deprived. We inherited from them as our right, instead of receiving as a boon, freedom of opinion, trial by jury, and all those great fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty which have rendered the Anglo-Saxon race the only free people on the face of the globe. And not the least prominent among our English characteristics, is the John Bull-ism which revolts at any, *the slightest interference with our social or political institutions*. We recognise cheerfully and gratefully our indebtedness to the parent stock and to the land of our fathers; but, like that branch of our large family which has not wandered from the ancestral hearthstone, *we permit no interference from abroad in our domestic affairs*. You may not admire the feeling, or it may not suit a short-sighted and selfish policy to regard it; but you cannot fail to respect it without condemning one of the most prominent traits in the character of Englishmen in every period of their history.

“Why, then, without cause, without a purpose, and in the full conviction that nothing but evil can be the result, should the *Times* and other English journals seize upon every opportunity which presents to censure, ridicule, and condemn the people of the United States? Why habitually discuss, only to condemn, portions of our civil polity, in relation to which they are as profoundly ignorant as they confessedly are of our social organization? Why venture to express opinions upon what they do not understand, or meddle with that which does not concern them? Can it be that such is the jealousy, envy, or hatred of the English people to everything American, that there exists a necessity to cater to such feeling; and that this necessity prompts the English press habitually to misrepresent our people and their institutions? I cannot believe this possible; but I cannot be mistaken in thinking, that a continuance of the injustice now practised towards us will not only build up an anti-American feeling in this country, but unavoidably and most justly result in arraying my own countrymen against everything English. Thus far our press has stood upon the defensive; but once show us that forbearance is not a virtue in the sight of Englishmen, and that the abuse of the English press is but the reflection of the hostility which that press has instilled into the English people, and you will soon learn that we can

find as many sores to lay open, as many abominations to expose, and as many local diseases to bring to light, as ever were presented against the people of the United States.

"If a brute of a slaveholder outrages humanity by beating his slave, our whole people are held up to censure and condemnation by the English press, as participators in the act; if an ignorant, half-educated backwoodsman, on the confines of civilization (whose life from the cradle has been spent with arms in his hands on an Indian frontier thousands of miles in extent), seeks redress from an enemy as savage as himself, by the use of the bowie-knife, the same press points to him with exultation as a type of American civilization; if from a coast extending thousands of miles along the Atlantic and Pacific shores of our continent, a band of adventurers escape the vigilance of our officers, and piratically invade the territory of a neutral, the same English press assures its readers that both our Government and our people are regardless of treaty obligations, and of the laws of neutrality; and even if a clever scoundrel in the civilized portions of our country commits forgery and swindles those who confide in him, the free press of England does not hesitate to present the case to the English public as one of 'American honesty'! As well might the American press argue, that because the *Times* newspaper is daily filled with the details of brutal Englishmen beating their wives, therefore it is evident that the whole English people are a set of brutes, who habitually indulge in this English sport; or because *Bell's Life in London* gives graphic accounts of the favourite English sport of 'the ring,' that therefore all Englishmen delight in that offspring of a 'higher civilization;' or because the late investigation into the administration of prison discipline at Birmingham exhibits a state of things which would revolt the feelings of the most brutal of the slave-dealers of our extreme South, that therefore there is no such thing as humanity or philanthropy in all England! Or if we deemed it expedient to call attention to your manufacturing districts, and invade the dark alleys and cheerless garrets of London, and drag to the light of Heaven the horrible starvation and misery which exists there, and annually consigns hundreds of thousands of victims to untimely graves, without even the consolations of religion to smooth their path; or if we should attempt to sum up the tens of thousands of human beings who in this Christian land annually perish without ever having received the benefits of education, or learnt that there is a God over all, a future state of reward and punishment, and a Saviour who died for sinners; if the American press were daily and habitually to present these isolated facts to the American people, and say to them, 'Such is England, and such the people who hate you with so cordial a hatred, that its press can only exist by abuse of you and your institutions, and by holding up your wives and daughters to the ridicule of such a people'—if, I say, such were the course of the American press towards the land of our fathers, it would be quite as just as is the practice of the English press towards the United States; and we, too, might create and

foster a spirit of hatred and hostility towards England quite as sincere, and far more potent than is, or can be, the hatred and contempt which the English press foolishly, recklessly, and most unadvisedly is creating against their Transatlantic brethren.

"But, thanks be to God and to our kindly feeling for the land of our fathers—to our recollections of the past and our hopes of the future—to our common origin, language, literature, and laws—and above all and over all, to our natural love of liberty and constitutional freedom, the American press, while it has witnessed with sorrow the injustice which we habitually suffer at the hands of our English brethren, has never yet sought to build up among our people a feeling hostile to England. Should the time arrive for such a proceeding—which God in his mercy avert!—you know quite as well as I can tell you, Sir, that we have among us a million and a half of people who have been driven by circumstances from the land of their birth, to seek an asylum on our shores, and who attribute their expatriation to the injustice of England, and are ever ready to act as propagandists of every charge which we might bring against her. We have but to indulge for a very short period in what you appear to consider *the luxury of abuse*, to accomplish what I would fain believe that, up to this period, TROLLOPE, HALL, DICKENS, and their associate slanderers of America, united to the *Times* and its co-labourers in the same work, have not accomplished on this side of the water.

"The pecuniary interests of England and America have become so interwoven and are so inseparable, that this consideration alone, aside from their common origin, should bind them together as one people. But, unfortunately, neither the press nor the great mass of the people of England, realize the extent of the commercial interests of the two countries, or its influence upon the general prosperity of both; and until the press of England will make the institutions of the United States and the feelings and opinions of our people its study, every intelligent and well-informed man in both countries will unite in asking, as a simple act of justice, that they do not meddle with what they do not understand, and with what they will not condescend to make themselves acquainted.

"On no one subject is the press of England so entirely mistaken, in regard to the feelings and wishes of our people, as in supposing that we desire to see a Republic anywhere in Europe. There are, it is true, fanatics and fanatical newspapers in the United States; and those fanatics are such socially, religiously, and politically; but the great mass of our people are too well-informed to believe that there exists a people in Europe capable of governing themselves through our republican institutions. Call it *vanity* or whatever you please, but they very sincerely, and in my judgment very correctly believe, that we are the only people on the face of the globe of sufficient general intelligence, united to a peculiar training and the antecedents of our political history, who are qualified to administer and sustain such a republic as that under which we live. We know, too, that it

is better suited to us, and insures us more well-regulated liberty, and greater national and individual prosperity, than it would be possible to attain under any other form of government. And yet, for the reasons referred to, we do not desire to see any more attempts at republics in Europe. What we do desire is, to see the constitutional and representative principle everywhere established; and we believe that the example of England is of primary importance in this gradual emancipation of man from the ignorance and wretchedness, moral, social, and political, in which despotism and religious tyranny have united to place him.

"And if such be the feelings and such the hopes and aspirations of the American people—and that they are may be safely inferred from my venturing to put my name to this communication—how is it possible that the *Times*, the leading paper in the world, and its able and intelligent co-labourers upon all questions except these which relate to America—how is it possible, I ask, that the English press, with a unanimity which it has never before evinced, and a perseverance which would do it honour in any other cause, can so zealously labour, day after day, and year after year, to build up a hostile feeling between two great nations so identical in origin, in interest, and in purpose? May I not assume that there has been more of thoughtlessness than of fixed purpose in all this—the *absence* of a kind feeling rather than the *presence* of an unkind one? And if so, why should not the press of England cease to thwart the wishes of the Governments of both countries, and aid the free and untrammelled press of the United States to unite in closer bonds nations who are bound together by every tie which it is possible for man to conceive, and hostilities between whom would not only be most unnatural, but a serious reflection upon the intelligence and the Christian civilization of the world?

"There are facts put forth in this communication which it is well to understand; and if the press of England will consider me a fair representative of the press of the United States (self-appointed), they may feel assured that, jointly, we of the press have it in our power to do more in a single year for the future peace and prosperity of the two greatest and freest nations in the world, than the Governments of the two countries could accomplish in half a century. It is for the press of England, and more especially for the *Times*, to determine whether there shall be peace, good fellowship, and union, now and for ever, between the press and the people of England and America.

"J. WATSON WEBB."

Thus, Sir, I wrote in 1853; and the people of England and the United States almost universally responded to the feelings expressed, and the *Daily News* especially, which has for two years past so manfully resisted the efforts of the *Times* to embroil the two countries, gave the "Thunderer" a severe and well-merited rebuke for its conduct. That American could be induced to write

a similar article to-day? And if he were to do so, there is too much reason to fear that the response on either side of the Atlantic would be exceedingly limited. The mischief I predicted has been accomplished—the Press has deceived and misled the people of England, and the people have acted upon the House of Commons, until none but the most fearless and consistent of that body dare to encounter the odium of standing by the people of the Northern States, whose cause was the cause of all England only ten years ago, as the very article to which I have called your attention abundantly proves, and who to-day with great unanimity look upon England as the sole cause of the rebellion having lasted six months.

Never was an appeal to the good feelings of a people more heartily responded to than was my letter to the *Times*. The personal abuse with which it was accompanied, only prompted your countrymen the more determinedly to be heard, and I was literally overwhelmed with letters and communications of the most friendly character. Among the number you will find in the paper enclosed a letter from the late (not *last*) Earl of Ellesmere—he who was Lord Francis Egerton. That letter was not intended for publication, but during one of my visits to Worsley or Hatchford (I am not certain which), he agreed with me that good might result from its being made public, and it was published accordingly in the United States, where it was properly appreciated. If ever there was one of whom the English aristocracy had reason to be proud, it was Lord Francis Egerton, the Earl of Ellesmere, and if you desire to prove in reply to Mr. Christie's insinuations, that he whose veracity you have endorsed and have faith in has a social *status*, even in England, quite equal to Mr. Christie's, you have only to proclaim that after ten years of intimacy and five of correspondence, the last letter which Lord Ellesmere ever wrote was addressed to me just before his death. That letter, speaking as it does of his domestic affairs, could not have been addressed under such circumstances by a man of such purity, refinement, and discrimination, to one unworthy of credit, when speaking of things within his own knowledge. It is now in the possession of her who in all that is noble was her husband's counterpart, the Dowager Countess Lady Harriet Ellesmere, at Hatchford, where, if you desire, you can at once relieve your mind from any doubts which Mr. Christie in the *Times*, or through his friends in the Commons, may have excited.

In connexion with this and a subsequent letter to the *Times* on "Yankee Privateers," I also enclose you a letter from Lord Clarendon to me, and which you are at liberty to use in any manner you please, because, with his assent, it was *published* in the United States, to put down a slander invented by the demo-

crazy, after the fashion of the *Times*, to produce ill-blood between the two countries. Lord Clarendon never lost sight of what was due to the honour of England, but he laboured incessantly to guard and protect her interests, commercial, economical, and political, by cultivating the most friendly relations between England and the United States. In this good work it was my pleasure, as it was my duty, to assist, and were it necessary or proper, I could send you more than fifty letters from him and his distinguished friends and associates, proving the character of the relations which existed between us.

And Earl Russell, whose purity and straightforwardness is even now combating fearlessly with the demon of strife the *Times* has nursed into being, at all times and on all occasions proved his devotion to England by seeking to preserve the best understanding with the United States.

LORD CLARENDON to GENERAL WEBB.

"Grove Court, March 19th, 1854.

"MY DEAR GENERAL WEBB,—I was unable to write to you yesterday, owing to the extreme pressure of business, which I must beg you to excuse.

"I do not exactly remember what I said to you on Wednesday, but I have no hesitation in saying now that General Cass's attack or charge against me has occasioned me the utmost surprise, as I can with truth assure you there is not a particle of foundation for it. When I spoke in the House of Lords (of the cordial and free understanding existing between France and England in relation to matters on both sides of the Atlantic), I was not thinking of the United States, but solely had in my mind the joint action of France and England (*in which the United States shared*) in Paraguay, Buenos Ayres, &c. In fact, I simply meant to show that the two countries, hitherto rivals, had learned to know each other better, and no longer intended to be disputing about nothing, and getting up rival factions in different parts of the world.

"Very truly yours,

"CLARENDON."

Did you require to be further sustained in having quoted one whose social position on both sides of the Atlantic admits of no question, you have it in the following from the late Dr. Wainwright, Bishop of New York, my life-long friend. Having left New York in his absence, he (ignorant of the fact that I had not my family with me) sent after me letters to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, Archdeacon Sinclair, and others, and also the following general letter to his friends in Great Britain:—

(Cont.)

"New York, Sept. 21st, 1863.

"My much-valued friend, General Webb, with members of his family, are upon a tour in England. I do not know their special destination; but they may be visiting Cathedral towns, the Universities, or other places of ecclesiastical interest, where I have friends, or where I may be known; I therefore take the liberty of introducing them as persons of high consideration in their own country, and worthy of all acceptance abroad. I shall feel greatly indebted to any of my brethren, the Bishops or the Clergy of the Church of England, or of the Scottish Episcopal Church, who will give them advice or facilities for seeing whatever may be worthy of notice in their respective neighbourhoods.

"JOHN M. WAINWRIGHT,
Pro. Bishop of New York."

But Lord Palmerston says in the Commons, "With regard to General Webb, I know nothing of him; and therefore I shall say nothing." This is simply forgetfulness; or it may arise from his still believing in a rumour of my death prevalent among my friends in England in the spring of 1861. Otherwise Lord Clarendon might remind him, that it was with him at his (Lord Clarendon's) table, after dinner, and when the other guests had retired, that was arranged the writing of my *second* letter to the *Times* on privateering; and I might recal to his lordship's recollection many other occasions when we met at his own house and in society, and when our relations were such that I felt authorized to give Mr. Seward, our present Secretary of State, a letter of introduction to him in 1859, who was received and treated by him most kindly, as indeed he treats everybody with whom he comes properly in contact. And I might remind him that subsequently he wrote me a very friendly letter, thanking me for having introduced Mr. Seward, and expressing such very kindly feelings towards the Government, that I took pleasure in circulating it among our statesmen, as well calculated to aid in the great work of building up the closest and most friendly relations between the two countries, which, for some cause or other, the *Times* has so zealously laboured to destroy, until it has well nigh succeeded.

You may think it strange that Lord Palmerston has forgotten me; but you must remember that I had been reported dead, and that probably Lord Palmerston heard and believed the report. Then there exists the John Bull determination to sustain an *employé* of the Government, right or wrong; and if to do so it became necessary to forget that Mr. Christie had been virtually disgraced by the Foreign Office only a few days before he made

reprisals upon the commerce of Brazil (*of which more anon*), it was exceedingly natural that I should be forgotten, and the "General Webb" who dared to resent Christie's arrogance assumed to be some one unfit for his post because he had the presumption to interpose in behalf of a young gentleman not belonging to his Legation, who was, on General Webb's account, and without any misconduct of his own, about to be seriously injured by the *false* representations of his official superior, W. Dugald Christie. Now, however, that Lord Palmerston is reminded of my existence, I am quite sure he will cheerfully admit that as a *man*, not as an American Minister, it was my duty to report to Earl Russell that *I*, and not Mr. North, was the offender; and to assume, as I did, the responsibility of saying that Mr. W. Dugald Christie "of that ilk," Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of H.B.M. to Brazil, was utterly unworthy of belief.

But you need not be told, Sir, that it is the custom of all administrations in England, at all times and under all circumstances, when it is possible, by straining a point, to sustain and uphold their agents. And I like the principle. Mr. Christie is well aware of the fact, and with no little cunning and greatly to his benefit, temporarily at least, has he availed himself of it. I have said officially to my Government, and I now repeat to you, my deliberate opinion and the opinion of the soundest heads in Rio, that if there had been no quarrel between Mr. Christie and myself, there would not have been any reprisals upon Brazilian commerce, nor would your navy have been forced, much against its inclinations, to perpetrate an outrage upon the sovereignty of Brazil.

You know too, better than any man in England, that Mr. Christie penned a deliberate falsehood when he wrote to Lord Russell that the most respectable of the English residents in Rio with great unanimity approved of his course in the matter of reprisals; and you know with equal certainty that there exists not a shade of the shadow of truth in his declaration to the public in the *Times* newspaper, that in his controversy with me in Rio, he "was supported by the sympathy and good opinion of all respectable men there of all nations, including General Webb's countrymen." Precisely the reverse was the fact. He was virtually in Coventry by his colleagues and society in general. But one solitary member of the Diplomatic Corps (France) offered even an apology for his conduct; and he (Mr. Christie), left his house and family at Petropolis in the midst of the heat of Midsummer, to go and take up his lodging on board of H.M.'s store ship in the Bay of Rio. And his countrymen, your old friends and associates here, as you were advised most truly, with one

voice condemned his conduct in his quarrel with me, and gave all their sympathies to his secretaries, the Hon. Mr. Eliot and the Hon. Mr. North, both of whom he ordered home because they would not sympathise with his infirmities and take part in his quarrels. And it was while labouring under the universal odium which he had incurred—isolated, alone, and invited into no gentleman's residence, he determined, as I and others believe, to make reprisals on Brazilian commerce, instead of proposing "arbitration," as he had authority from Lord Russell to do at his discretion. He knew that he would thus compel the British Government to sustain him, and he hoped to escape in the smoke of the greater fire. In this he has partially succeeded; and in the almost universal rule to sustain British agents abroad, I find the key to the apparent sympathy for him in the Commons.

When in London in 1861, on my way to Brazil, I called to see and pay my respects to such of the distinguished gentlemen who had been kind to me in 1853 and 1854 as were in town; and if my recollection serves me, Lord Clarendon and the late Marquis of Lansdowne met at my rooms at Fenton's. I was on my way to France to have an interview with the Emperor, I having known him in the United States when in exile, in 1836; and well knowing from those who had been kind to him during that period, and from autograph letters written to me since he became Emperor of France, that it is a noble trait in the character of that remarkable man—who has lived down all the early slanders of the *Times*, and who will ultimately be conceded to be as great as he has proved himself to be able—that he never forgets what he is pleased to consider kindness in bygone days, no matter how slight; and I promised to report to the Marquis on my return the nature of my reception. I did so with pleasure; and in a second letter, devoted solely to that subject, I insisted that the circumstances therein related fully sustained all I had said of his rare peculiarity in that regard; and in one of my letters I requested the Marquis to send me his photograph. I send you the Marquis' reply, as demonstrating that in his judgment at least, I was in 1861 as worthy of his friendship as in 1853 and 1854. And thus you have my *status* as a reputable witness made out up to the time when Mr. Christie thought proper to quarrel with me, as he had previously quarrelled with almost all his other colleagues.

MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE to GENERAL WEBB.

Lansdowne House, London,

Aug. 30th, 1861.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I am only for two days in London, of which I am about to take leave for some time, but cannot proceed into

Wiltshire, where I have a good deal of provincial business awaiting me, without thanking you for your very obliging letter which I found on my arrival in Berkeley-square. *Your account of the Emperor is very satisfactory.*

"Your wish respecting the photographs is too flattering not to be immediately and willingly complied with. I am sorry that I have not more by me than those which I enclose. They are not thought good.

"I am afraid there is little chance of your being able to come into Wiltshire before you sail for Rio Janeiro, or I should be truly happy to receive you at my home there. I hope I may have other opportunities, and remain ever

"Very faithfully yours,

"LANSDOWNE.

"I left Mrs. Motley at Cromer, in Norfolk, the end of last week, quite ignorant of her husband's appointment" [to Vienna, of which Gen. Webb had informed the Marquis].

The first duty of a good lawyer is to sustain the character of any witness upon whose testimony his case depends, and on the same principle I have deemed it my duty to support your witness. You ventured to quote from your place in Parliament a charge against the veracity of the English Minister in Brazil, and for so doing you have been badgered, and called upon to retract, explain, and apologize, on the alleged ground that your authority was not reliable. In short, your witness was impeached. I was the witness upon whose testimony you insinuated charges against Mr. Christie's truthfulness; and, fortunately for me, you discovered in his own writings sufficient to warrant all you had charged. My first duty to you, therefore, was to answer the question of your antagonists—Who is Gen. Webb? and my next, to prove that you quoted a witness whose social position is quite equal to that of any who assailed him.

In all human probability I shall never again visit England and therefore it is *not of the slightest importance to me what estimate those who do not know me may form in regard to the social position at home or abroad of the United States' Minister in Brazil.* But, as a gentleman, I owed it to you, Sir, who have been unhandsonely treated in the House of Commons because you would not impeach the character of your own witness, to show that your witness was unimpeachable, and his testimony entitled to implicit faith.

I have accomplished this disagreeable work in my own way, at the risk of being tedious. There was, however, no alternative but to leave you unsupported and abandon you to the tender mercies of those who accused you of quoting a worthless witness.

was deceiving me and not in deference to my wife's wishes, I started to walk (not being able to get a conveyance) nearly two miles in a September tropical sun, to Mr. Sonnleithner's residence on Octólogo Bay. Judge my astonishment and indignation when he assured me that there was *not one word of truth* in what Mr. Christie had said: that, so far from relieving us from our engagement to dinner, he expected Mr. and Miss Christie, and had, since he saw us in the morning, invited the French Minister to be of the party. I explained to him the absolute necessity of addressing me a note in regard to the matter, to which I would reply in writing, and then place the notes in Mr. Christie's hands, as the only mode of dealing with one who exhibited such little regard for the truth. He accordingly wrote me a note denying that in his interview that morning with Mr. Christie he had released me from my engagement, but, on the contrary, had invited Mr. Christie and his daughter to dine with him the next day, and had since invited the French Minister and others, and concluded with remarking that he expected us to dine with him.

I wrote in reply that we should (v. v.) certainly dine with him on the morrow at the time named. I then returned to Mr. Christie's, and sent him Mr. Sonnleithner's note, together with a copy of my reply.

What followed you will find related in my despatch. Here was a most deliberate falsehood proved upon him. He did not even pretend to deny it, or attempt to give it the character of a misapprehension, but had the insufferable impudence to ask me to become a party to his infamy, in order, as he said, that he might "give the Austrian blackguard a lesson."

At M. d'Eichmann's, Mr. Sonnleithner at once agreed, for the sake of peace, to waive his claims to our company. To this I objected, as an unnecessary concession to one who had acted so ungentlemanly, and as it was obvious that he did not intend to dine with Sonnleithner, it was agreed that he should resign us to Mr. Christie, on condition that Christie agreed to dine with him on the following Wednesday. It was also agreed that Mr. Christie should be required to say *aye* or *no* to the propositions put to him, and that if "*no*," Mrs. Webb, my niece, and self, should return to M. d'Eichmann's in his carriage, and become his guests instead of Mr. Christie's.

We accordingly started for Mr. Christie's—M. d'Eichmann, Mr. Sonnleithner, and myself—and on reaching there, we had an interview with Mr. Christie. I said to Mr. Christie: "I have stated all the facts of the case to these gentlemen, and M. d'Eichmann will make you a proposition, every word of which we have duly considered. To that proposition you are to assent

or dissent, without any discussion. The latter, which could only lead to an unfortunate result. If you assent, the whole affair is disposed of; if you do not assent, Mrs. Webb and my niece return with us to M. d'Eichmann's, whose guests we will become instead of yours."

Mr. d'Eichmann then said: "I am instructed to say that Mr. Sonnleithner gives up his right to entertain General Webb and his family to-morrow, releases them from their engagement, and consents that they dine with you, *on condition* that you and your daughter dine with Mr. Sonnleithner on Wednesday."

Mr. Christie.—"With the greatest pleasure in the world." And that, too, after Mr. Sonnleithner had certified that he, Christie, had wilfully and maliciously misrepresented him!

Of course, this affair rapidly circulated through the Diplomatic Corps, nearly all of whom dined with Mr. Sonnleithner, who had invited them to meet my family. We were not present; and the only explanation that could be given was the simple truth. As it was a case of such gross falsehood, it is not surprising that Mr. Christie's habitual disregard of truth became subject of discussion; and then followed anecdote upon anecdote, illustrating his infirmity.

But I addressed what I did to Earl Russell, upon knowledge, not rumour. On the day of our quarrel at M. de Glinka's, Christie told me a very deliberate falsehood; which, in connexion with his habit of sneering at everything American, and his evident determination to fasten a quarrel on me, induced Mrs. Webb and myself gravely to determine never again to enter his house, while we would treat him in society as if there existed no misunderstanding between us. It is unnecessary to describe that falsehood; but examine carefully the correspondence, and you will discover that while I, in the spirit in which our difficulty had been settled, went to Mrs. Webb and reported to her that we could not carry out our determination not to visit at Christie's, but must act as if nothing had happened—the past being buried in oblivion—(see my despatch to Mr. Seward), he was exacting from his secretary, the Hon. Mr. North, a pledge not to visit at our house; and when he failed to procure it, *ordered* him not to do so. Mr. North refused to obey him, and a quarrel ensued; and when Mr. Christie is charged by me with violating the terms of our settlement, he writes me a letter dated the 5th November, in which he says:—

"I should have thought that you would have given me an opportunity of contradicting such an imputation, before giving it belief and speaking of it. . . . I beg now again to tell you that in this instance you are completely in error—that *I have not violated my engagement*, and have not traduced you."

Now turn to Mr. North's letter, written the day before the 5th November, and you will perceive how utterly false is the foregoing. You will there perceive that he had not only made the proposition in person to Mr. North, but through Mr. Brodie more than once; and that that individual had tried to persuade Mr. North to yield, and devised a mode for framing a truthful apology. Then turn to the "summary" appended to the correspondence for the convenience of my colleagues in understanding it, and to my despatch to Washington: and finally, call upon Mr. Christie to produce a copy of his letter to Mr. North of the 7th November, in which he charges him with a breach of official confidence by making to me, "and out of the Legation, *revelations of confidential statements made to you by me, about any of my colleagues!*"

I repeat most solemnly, after mature reflection and consideration, that I have never, in the course of a long life, met with such deliberate and malicious falsehood on the part of one holding the position of a gentleman, and believed to be of sound mind, as was within my own knowledge, with regard to Mr. Christie, when I wrote what I did to Earl Russell. I know that only on the day before he had deliberately committed to paper what he well knew to be false; I was familiar with all his movements and intrigues, promises and threats, to compel a junior to take part in his quarrel; and I could not be insensible to his malicious falsehood in relation to Mr. Sonnleithner. And therefore, leaving out of view the innumerable anecdotes of his habitual disregard of truth, vouched for by persons of established veracity, I had sufficient evidence in my own possession and connected with my own affairs, to write what I now reiterate, that "all the circumstances of the case go to prove a reckless disregard of truth on the part of Mr. Christie, which is not characteristic of a gentleman, and certainly not commendable in the representative of the English nation."

And here I might leave Mr. Christie and his claim to be considered a gentleman of veracity, but look at his charge against the Hon. W. G. C. Eliot, his first Secretary of Legation, for misconduct on board H.M.'s flag-ship *Fort*, in the harbour of Rio. Having determined to quarrel with Mr. Eliot, as was his custom with subordinates, he trumped up the charge of ungentlemanly conduct on board the *Fort* on some public occasion, without the semblance of a warrant for so doing. He then gave Mr. Eliot the option to go home on leave, *on a false plea of urgent private business*, or be ordered home under charges of a disgraceful character. Mr. Eliot replied that he had no urgent private business which required his presence in England, and therefore would not so represent, and was quite ready to meet the alternative. He

was accordingly ordered home for ungentlemanly conduct on board the *Fort*; but I am told that he took with him letters from every officer of the ship, pronouncing the charge untrue. I believe Mr. Christie added other charges of immorality known to be equally false; and as evidence of the light in which Mr. Christie's colleagues viewed his conduct, immediately before Mr. Eliot's sailing, the Interauncio of the Pope and senior of the Corps Diplomatique in Brazil gave him a dinner to which most of the members of our Corps were invited.

Mr. Eliot sailed from here in the steamer of the 8th of November, and my letter to Earl Russell, together with the correspondence to which it refers, went forward by the same steamer. Mr. Eliot reached London about the 6th of December. About the 20th, the letters by the steamer of the 25th of November arrived; and brought Mr. North's story—the information that he, too, had been ordered home, and his private letters withheld from him; and also, strong expressions of public opinion, on the part of the British residents here, against the apparently *insane* conduct of Mr. Christie. And very shortly after, it was deliberately determined by the Foreign Office, with all the facts of the case in possession, that Mr. Christie should *leave* Brazil, and that the Hon. Mr. Eliot, whom he had sent home in disgrace, should take his place; and that the Hon. Mr. North, of whose private papers Mr. Christie had possessed himself, and ordered North home, should report for duty to Mr. Christie's successor!

Was ever disgrace more thorough and complete? And from whom came the blow? Why, from Her Majesty's Foreign Office, and with the full sanction of Lord Palmerston. But the canny schemer who had made himself so notorious in the River Plate and in Rio determined not to fall thus; and in anticipation of the blow which he well knew must come, he determined to get up a difficulty with Brazil of such magnitude that personal questions would be lost sight of, and he escape in the smoke of the larger fire. He accordingly availed himself of the "discretion" with which he had unfortunately been invested, and instead of offering "arbitration" to Brazil, made reprisals upon her commerce, outraged her sovereignty, and jeopardized the lives of all the British residents in the country. The consequences were, in part, what he anticipated; but not all he weakly proclaimed that he expected. The news of his outrages here it was known could not reach London until about the 4th of February; and Mr. Christie predicted, that then Mr. Eliot would not be sent out to relieve him, and that he, Christie, would be sustained and left in his position. Sustained he has been; and will continue to be, as a matter of principle; but your

Government is too wise to confide further in a madman, and the Hon. Mr. Elliot did relieve him. And thus the very individual who sailed from here in November, charged with ungentlemanly conduct by his superior, is acquitted by Lord Palmerston's Administration, and ordered back in December, to take the place, as the representative of England, of the man who had persecuted him; and the man whom Mr. Christie attempted to disgrace by the most malicious misrepresentations is now occupying his place as Her Majesty's Representative at the Court of Brazil! Was this even-handed justice, or was it but a miserable exhibition of political influence in behalf of those whom Mr. Christie always described as useless "sprigs of nobility"? If, as I am sure it was, this was but an act of justice worthy of Earl Russell, how ridiculous is the position of those gentlemen who sustain Mr. Christie and the Administration in the House of Commons? England's, or rather Mr. Christie's, difficulty with Brazil is a matter which does not concern me; but inasmuch as he has maliciously misrepresented his affair with me, it is satisfactory to know, that before it was known at the Foreign Office that he had insulted and outraged Brazil, he had been most thoroughly disgraced by his official superiors for ungentlemanly conduct. It is for you to discover how much of merit there was in his proceedings against Brazil, and whether it is sufficient to cancel the disgrace brought upon himself by his previous conduct. And may you inquire of Lord Palmerston—"If, as you said in your debate on the 8th of May, 'Mr. Christie is a gentleman and a man of honour, and as to his veracity, no man can question that veracity with any semblance of truth whatever'—why did you, in December, abandon and disgrace him because of false charges made against his subordinates? Why, but to render your condemnation of his falsehood and general misconduct more palpable, and his disgrace more significant, did you recall him from Brazil, and give his place to the very subordinate whom he had sent home in disgrace? Why, but because you found him wanting in that very veracity which, now that he has been the agent of the Government who involved us in our serious misunderstanding with Brazil, you deem it your policy, if not your duty, to uphold?"

That Mr. Christie made gross and very palpable misrepresentations to Earl Russell, you have demonstrated in your letter of the 24th of April; and in the extract he publishes in the *Times* of the 8th of May, from his report to Lord Russell of our difficulty, and find him declaring he "can boldly say" to his official superior, that leaving here, after three years of service, he "is respected by all honest men and by the Brazilian Government and society."

I take upon me to declare that there is not one word of truth

in this. It is publicly denied by the press of Brazil; and you, Sir, have doubtless had it contradicted by your friends and countrymen in Brazil. And he says to the public in the same paper: "I have thus maintained silence during four months in Rio Janeiro, supported, however, by the sympathy and good opinion of all respectable men there, of all nations, including General Webb's countrymen." The answer of every member of the Diplomatic Corps whose attention has been called to this matter is in substance the same: "We know of but two members of our Corps who, at the time Mr. Christie left Brazil, maintained any relations with him, except what respect for his position, as official representative of England, demanded of us." The Brazilians have always disliked Mr. Christie; and you, Sir, well know, with what measure of esteem your countrymen regarded him. The declaration is utterly without foundation; but I only feel called upon to deny so much of it as relates to "General Webb's countrymen."

In the same statement, Mr. Christie, as usual, resorts to misrepresentation and deception to sustain himself. He knows very well, as I have already shown, that the immediate cause of my threat to inflict upon him the personal chastisement he so richly merited had little or nothing to do with the quarrel itself. He had behaved so badly, had been so rude and ungentlemanly, and so exceedingly annoying in his treatment of us, that before proceeding to M. de Glinka's on the evening of the rupture, we had gravely resolved that, as an act of prudence, and with a view to avoid the rupture it was manifest he was seeking, we would not again visit at his house, but content ourselves with treating him politely in society. In this connexion I could mention things so monstrous and ungentlemanly, that if known to you they would fill you with astonishment, and fully justify the conclusion long since forced upon me, that at intervals, and when labouring under a peculiar excitement, the man is *insane*.

The following is Mr. Christie's version of our difficulty: "My words were, in answer to a censure by General Webb of my play at whist, he being my partner, 'You talked so much, General, as to put me out' [a most innocent and lamb-like remark]. I appealed to the Russian and Prussian Ministers, MM. de Glinka and d'Eichmann, and I subjoin their testimonies. Their statements as to what I said, are very clear and satisfactory."

M. de Glinka says, "It would now be impossible for me to decide with precise accuracy whether the words used by you were, 'You talk so much that you put me out,' or 'You talk too much.'" Where did M. de Glinka get this latter phrase, so precisely accurate? Assuredly Mr. Christie did not suggest it; he only inquired whether the phrase was not the honeyed one

he has substituted. No; he heard it used, saw its effects, and it became deeply impressed upon his mind, until called upon to say whether it was not what, to a foreigner, appears to be very like it.

Mr. Christie knows very well that "*you talk too much*" was the precise phrase. Just four words—no more, no less; and by tone and manner, rendered as offensive to the party addressed, as they were intended to be by him who used them. He knows, too, the wide difference between the two phrases, and yet he characteristically avails himself of the chances that a foreigner would not appreciate any difference between two phrases as widely dissimilar as is light and darkness. Now, take my version of the words and manner which acted as a match upon the explosive materials he had so industriously piled up between us, and which I had that very day sought to remove or render harmless by arranging with my family to abstain from all unnecessary intercourse with one so dangerous.

We were, as was our custom, playing whist at shilling points. Christie was my partner; both parties were at four, and the odd trick therefore determined the game and the rub. Trumps were all exhausted, and there were but three cards in each hand. It was Christie's lead. He knew, or rather he ought to have known, that we had all the diamonds, I holding the three highest and he a low one. Our adversaries had the winning cards of the other two suits. Mr. Christie paused to consider what he should lead, when M. de Glinka remarked, "I do not know what you are hesitating about; we only want one trick more, and here are the ace of spades and ace of hearts (showing them). We are out." I answered, "Not certainly; it depends upon Mr. Christie. If he leads the right card, it is we that are out instead of you." Mr. Christie did not lead his diamond, and of course our adversaries won the game.

I then, without addressing Mr. Christie at all, pointed out to M. de Glinka that if my partner had played his diamond, we should have won the game, which of course he at once conceded; and then it was that Mr. Christie, to whom I had not addressed one word, drew himself up, and said, in a manner the most offensive and insulting you can imagine, "*You talk too much.*"

Had he used the phrase which he has since invented, it would simply have been an untruth, as I had made but one observation before the hand was played out, and that not to him, and I should only have considered the remark as characteristic, because untrue; but using the words he did, in the manner he did, and after what had previously passed between us, was more than I felt called upon to bear; and, inasmuch as I represent a Govern-

went not identified with the policy of Europe, and which does not expect of me to submit to any impertinence from an English Minister which I would resent if it came from a less important personage, I took upon myself the responsibility of reading him a lecture which he had long needed and which he will not readily forget. At all events, I have not learned that since then he has had the bad manners, in presence of Americans, to sneer at our generals, ridicule our soldiers, and give utterance to the insulting sentiment, that "the descendants of the *Partisans* must necessarily be inferior in courage to the Rebels, because wanting in that *chivalry* which pertains to the gentle blood of the *Cavaliers*."

Then came the settlement; and here again the peculiarities of the man exhibited themselves. He first tried bullying, and demanded a meeting in the morning or an apology. And when the answer came—"A meeting at sunrise and no apology," he insisted that M. de Glinka misunderstood him, which De Glinka peremptorily denies. But this is an old game, and, most unfortunately for Mr. Christie, has been played twice by him in this town of Petropolis. When, two years ago, he rudely turned the representative of Prussia out of his house, he went to his colleague representing one of the Great Powers, stated what he had done, said of course he would be challenged and must fight, and asked the gentleman applied to to accept the forthcoming challenge, and act as his friend. The challenge did come, was formally accepted, and ——— went to Mr. Christie to get instructions for the final arrangements, when behold he was assured by Mr. Christie that he had been "misunderstood!" This fact, for fact it unquestionably is, I should not have felt at liberty to repeat to you, having received it from the gentleman who had been requested to accept the challenge, if Mr. Christie's late statement in the *Times*, and his miserable pretence that M. de Glinka "misunderstood" his message to me, had not revived the old affair of a similar boast and a similar mode of escape, and caused it to be the subject of general conversation both in and out of the diplomatic circle.

If you will refer to my letter to Mr. Christie, appended to my letter to Earl Russell, you will perceive that I say, "It is unnecessary to allude to some trifling discussion between you and your friends." I will, however, explain to you to what I allude, in order that you may the better comprehend your man. When Messrs. de Glinka and d'Eichmann reported to me what Mr. Christie had authorized them to say in withdrawing his offensive language, I asked them to accompany me to where Mr. Christie was standing in the moonlight, when I made my remarks and extended my hand. Instead of taking my hand, he began—"But you had no right to suppose I intended to offend."

stopped him, and said I could not, and would not, listen to any discussion on the subject. "Your friends have said thus and thus—I respond so and so—there is my hand." He answered, "They had no authority thus to act." To which I replied, "Gentlemen, there appears to be some mistake here. It is no business of mine. Of course what I have said passes for nothing;" and I withdrew. When Mr. Christie repudiated the action of his friends, their looks and manner were not amiable, and I left him with a feeling of pity as well as contempt, well assured that he was in an unpleasant predicament. However, the matter was soon arranged between them; now, it is not for me to know; and very shortly the gentlemen came to me and said, that if I would again go to Mr. Christie and do as before, all would be well.

One case more, illustrating Mr. Christie's veracity, and I have done. Mr. Christie reported to Earl Russell from here, as a charge against his Chief Secretary Eliot, now in charge of this mission, and whom he sought to disgrace by falsehood and misrepresentation, that he, Eliot, had endeavoured to injure his junior, Mr. Brodie, by telling me that he was not a man of truth. Mr. Eliot of course vindicated himself from such an imputation by denying it; and on his return to Rio, to supersede and relieve from duty the superior who had sent him out of the country as unworthy of association with the *corps diplomatique*, he inquired of me whether he had ever expressed to me any opinion of Mr. Brodie. I promptly replied by a hasty note, of which I did not retain a copy, demonstrating that such a charge could not be true, because we had met but once after Mr. Brodie's arrival until his, Mr. Eliot's, return to Rio as *Chargé d'Affaires*, and then only in general company. After reading Mr. Christie's publication in the *Times*, I wrote to Mr. Eliot for a copy of my note, and received the following reply:—

"Rio Janeiro, June 10th, 1863.

"MY DEAR GENERAL,—On my return from England I told you that Mr. Christie had charged me with stating to you that Mr. Brodie was not veracious, or other words to the same effect. Being conscious that I never had said so to you, I requested you to be good enough to state whether my conviction was correct or not, as I was not willing to have it supposed that I had attempted to set the most hospitable member of the *corps diplomatique* against a young man just arrived. Your answer is dated March 14th, and is as follows:—

"From the time I became acquainted with Mr. Brodie at Mr. Christie's (he says he met me at dinner at Lord Lyons, in Washington, but of which I have no recollection, and certainly I never

heard his name mentioned), you and I never met but once until yesterday. You called at Christie's with Captain White; and I am quite certain that in the conversation which took place in the drawing-room, where there were present from eight to ten persons, Mr. Brodie (who had then been in Brazil about five days) was not discussed. We returned to Petropolis, and you did not visit there previous to your departure for England. You certainly never expressed any opinion of Mr. Brodie to me, whether favourable or otherwise. This, my dear General, is all in your letter of which I believe you to want a copy; the remainder being a few anecdotes which have no reference to Mr. Christie.

"Hoping that Mrs. Webb and the boys are well, believe me

"Yours very sincerely,

"W. G. C. ELLIOT."

Very certain it is, that in all this region—that is, on the *La Plata* and in Brazil—Mr. Christie has established for himself the unenviable reputation of being *untruthful* and quarrelsome. And in this connexion permit me to call your attention to the publication made by Mr. Holly Hudson, the United States Consul at Buenos Ayres, which is appended to, and constitutes a part of my official despatch to Mr. Seward, as illustrating the character and propensities of the British Minister in Brazil. Take this in connexion with his controversies with his secretaries and attachés, tradespeople and domestics; his turning the Prussian Minister out of his house, and his quarrels with almost every member of the diplomatic corps, and you have such a picture of an English Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, as his countrymen in Rio would not have entrusted with unlimited "discretion" in settling international questions of great delicacy with Brazil; and who has most recklessly, and from selfish considerations, plunged the two nations into their existing difficulties. And, strange as it may appear, I, with whom he is quarrelling hardest just now, am almost the only apologist for this "extraordinary" envoy. I believe Mr. Christie to be goodhearted and weak, but exceedingly selfish and arrogant—one who presumes upon his *official* position, the dignity of which (so much above his *social* one) has completely bewildered him, and, with other *special* causes, rendered him much of the time *insane*. On no other theory can his vagaries be accounted for, because he is a person of good natural abilities and fair acquirements. And that such a man could be guilty of such conduct as I have in part only described, can be accounted for on no other supposition than that he is at times more or less *insane*. I first put forth this theory in the "summary" I attached to our correspondence; and I

gravely reasoned it with him in the letter I had occasion to write him on the 24th November last (which I enclose), remonstrating against his withholding from Mr. North private letters forwarded to his care. His puerile "statement" in the *Times* of the 8th of May confirms me not only in my conviction of his occasional insanity, but in regard to the *special* cause of that insanity; and therefore I bear him no ill-will, and entertain for him no unkind feelings, except what arise from having imposed upon me the necessity of writing to you this long letter, which you have authority to use in such manner as you may deem expedient.

I have already said that I had nothing whatever to do with the publication of my letter to Earl Russell, and the correspondence attached, and that I had no suspicion even of the manner in which it became public. Since commencing this letter, however, I have ascertained that Mr. Christie was the sole cause of its publication. One of the charges he made against Mr. Eliot was improper associations among your countrymen in Rio, very unmistakably referring to a gentleman well known to you. That gentleman and others supposed to be alluded to promptly addressed notes of inquiry to Mr. Christie, inquiring whether *they* were the parties alluded to. To all such inquiries Mr. Christie answered No! And this *no*, applied in turn to *every English family in which Mr. Eliot visited*, of course left the charge a naked and malicious falsehood. But they were not content with his thus getting away from a grave official charge upon their respectability; and they it was who published and circulated our correspondence, together with my letter to Earl Russell, all of which I have reason to believe has been formally communicated to you by your friends in Rio. Thus much for the "sympathy" he received from his countrymen.

One word in regard to my letter to Earl Russell. Instead of writing direct to him I intended (see my letter to Mr. Brodie of Nov. 5) to forward to his lordship a copy of my official despatch to Mr. Seward. Mr. Christie rendered this impossible; and I was compelled, if I desired to guard Mr. North from the malicious misrepresentations of his superior, to write direct to Earl Russell. This I did at two o'clock in the morning, to save the mail; and the only error I committed was signing that letter officially as "Envoy U.S." If before mailing the letter I had *erased* the words "Legation of the United States," and my official title, it would have been in all respects such a letter as every gentleman, under the circumstances, would have felt it his duty to write. My Government disapproved, very properly, of its official character; and on the 24th May I addressed Earl Russell the following letter:—

Petropolis, May 24th, 1863.

To the Right Hon. Earl Russell,

MR. LORD.—On the 7th of November last I addressed your Lordship a statement in regard to a difficulty between Mr. Christie and myself, in which the Hon. Mr. North, an attaché to H.B.M.'s Legation to Brazil, had become involved, and from which he was in danger of being materially injured, although innocent of any participation in my affair with his official superior. He was threatened with punishment simply because he would not take part in Mr. Christie's quarrel with me, and cease his social intercourse with my family; and it assuredly became my duty to protect him as far as possible. I therefore said to Mr. Brodie that I should, as it was my duty to do, "make this matter the subject of a despatch to Mr. Seward, a copy of which I should forward to Earl Russell," in vindication of Mr. North. Had I done so, and accompanied that paper with a private note (which our past personal relations warranted), showing that I was the innocent cause of bringing Mr. North in collision with his superior, I think there can be no reasonable doubt but your sense of justice of what was due from me to Mr. North under the circumstances, would not only have justified my course, but have vindicated it as one from which I could not with honour abstain.

But Mr. Christie's highly improper conduct in refusing to say whether he considered himself bound by the arrangement made with Mr. Brodie, in regard to troubling your lordship on the subject, rendered such a course impossible. His answer was waited for until after midnight; the mail was to leave for Rio at six A.M.; if anything was to be done to counteract the intentions of Mr. Christie, which he had announced to a gentleman of character, but subsequently denied, there was no time for delay. To prepare a despatch to Mr. Seward and send a copy to your lordship within the time at my disposal was impossible; and therefore, actuated solely by my desire to hold harmless Mr. North, and by the wishes of my colleagues to see him vindicated, I addressed your lordship directly on the subject.

In doing so my communication commenced, "Legation of the United States;" and I signed it in my official capacity. In this I was wrong, because I should have erased the words "Legation of the United States." For this I have been censured by my Government; and for this breach of etiquette I owe your lordship an apology, which, without instigation from any source, I hereby tender, and beg that if the paper referred to be still in existence, you will erase from it the words "Legation of the United States" and my official signature. Then it will become what it should have been originally—such a communication as one gentleman had not only a right, but was bound to make to another, to secure

from unjust censure one whose sole offence consisted in resisting an ungentlemanly attempt on the part of his official superior to involve a subordinate in a personal difficulty with a colleague, with which that subordinate had no connexion whatever. My letter to your lordship best explains my motive in addressing you, which was solely to exonerate Mr. North from unmerited censure, and to assume myself the entire responsibility of my rupture with Mr. Christie.

With great respect, I have the honour to be

Your Lordship's obedient Servant,
(Signed) J. WATSON WEBB.

In conclusion I will merely remark, that while the Press of Brazil, without exception, ridicules Mr. Christie's assumption that he was respected here by either foreigners or Brazilians, and while your countrymen are busily circulating your correspondence with him and repudiating all sympathy with his conduct, whether private or official, the United States' Consul at Rio Janeiro, late the President of the Senate of Ohio, and nearly all his life a distinguished professor in one of our colleges, sends me the following. Mr. Christie, with his usual truth, proclaims through the *Times*, that "he had the sympathy and good opinion of all respectable men here, of all nations, including General Webb's countrymen." My countrymen investigate and inquire, and report to the United States' Consul that they cannot find an *American in Rio* who sympathized with Mr. Christie on the occasion referred to! And yet this is the gentleman of truth and veracity to whom you were expected to make concessions in the Commons, in order that his character might be *whitewashed*, and he be made a creditable witness against Brazil!

Rio de Janeiro, June 16th, 1863.

To his Excellency Genl JAMES WATSON WEBB,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister
Plenipotentiary from the United States
to the Court of Brazil.

SIR,—The enclosed communication, which will explain itself, has been addressed to me by a number of our countrymen in Rio da Janeiro, with the request that I would forward it to you.

I was not in Rio Janeiro at the time of your difficulty with Mr. Christie, but I arrived about the 1st of March, when the subject was still fresh in the minds of Americans. Naturally, it often became the topic of conversation among them in my hearing, and Mr. Christie is certainly in error when he states that he had the sympathy of General Webb's countrymen. I often heard Americans speak of you in the most complimentary manner, commending the spirit, vigour, and correctness which

you had exhibited, not only in the affair with Mr. Christie, but in your course generally. So much was I impressed with the favourable opinion which you had secured from your countrymen, that without your knowledge, and when I had never seen you but once, I wrote somewhat at length upon the subject to a gentleman occupying a high official position at Washington. I could not forbear to express to him the gratification which I felt when I found with what courage and decision you had maintained the honour of our flag in this distant land, at a time, too, when courage and decision were never more needed. Not that your course here had been other than what I had expected of you. I had known something of your high position at home—of your many years of efficient service in the cause of great principles and important public interests there. I had known something of your family, whose members for more than two hundred years had been always upright and patriotic, and often distinguished members of the Commonwealth. All this I had known, and I did not expect to see the flag, when upheld by your hand, trailing in the dust. But it was gratifying to me to learn, on arriving in Brazil, not only that your course had been worthy of your high antecedents, but that it was appreciated and applauded by your countrymen.

I conclude by saying that I have heard *no American*, since my arrival in Rio Janeiro, *express any sympathy for Mr. Christie* in his controversy with you, nor do I believe that *any American has felt or expressed any such sympathy.*

I have the honour to be, with great respect,

(Signed)

JAMES MONROE
U.S. Consul.

Rio de Janeiro, June 16th, 1863.

HON. JAMES MONROE,
Consul of the United States.

SIR,—The attention of the undersigned citizens of the United States, resident in Rio de Janeiro, has been called to a communication addressed to the *London Times* of May 8th, by Mr. Christie, the English Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Brazil, in relation to certain difficulties between himself and the American Minister, General Webb, which excited no little attention here for some months previous to your arrival.

Mr. Christie says:—"I have thus maintained silence during four months in Rio Janeiro, supported, however, by the sympathy and good opinion of all respectable men there, of all nations, including General Webb's countrymen."

We feel compelled, both in justice to General Webb, our Minister, and in vindication of the truth, most emphatically to deny the correctness of the statement that Mr. Christie had our sympathy in the controversy to which reference has been made. *We have never heard any American express such sympathy for Mr. Christie, nor do we believe that it has existed among Americans.* We would not attempt to say what were the views "of all respectable men of all nations" concerning this affair, but content ourselves with repudiating so much of the foregoing statement as relates to "General Webb's countrymen."

(Signed)

THOMAS RAINEY.
GEORGE N. DAVIS.
HENRY E. MILFORD.
EDWARD FALES.
EDWARD H. WILLIS.
BARBITT A. OSBORNE.
SAMUEL C. TALBOT.
CHARLES T. DURIVAL.
C. J. HARRAH.
GEORGE P. CARR.
WM. VAN VLECK LIDGERWOOD.
HENRY M. SPYER.
E. W. SMITH.
DR. OTTO W. E. VAN TUYL.

ANDREW J. INGLIS.
CHARLES J. ROGERS.
W. S. B. VAN ORDEN, jun.
BENJAMIN FERGUSON.
FRANKLIN PALMER.
HENRY LEWIS.
J. W. GRAHAM.
HORACE T. FOGG.
DR. JOSE A. DE CINIHO.
WILLIAM F. JONES.
W. MILNER ROBERTS.
J. O. SMITH.
JAMES M. SMITH.
Citizens of the United States.

I believe, Sir, I have fully redeemed my promise, and that I have not only established the respectability of your witness, but demonstrated the justice of my charge, that the late Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from Great Britain to Brazil is not a man of truth, and was an unworthy representative of the English people.

With great admiration for one who has so fearlessly vindicated the truth,

I have the honour to be,

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. WATSON WEBB.

*Extract from Despatch No. 29 from GENERAL WEBB to the
HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD.*

An American who represents his country abroad in a diplomatic appointment of the highest grade is a very different being from the same personage in his private and social relations at home. He has virtually sacrificed all his individuality to his

country; and by the common consent of civilized nations, and the fiction of international law, which makes his house for the time being a part of his own country, and confers upon it and him the privileges of *ex-territoriality*, he virtually is, in the eye of the law, the country he represents. Hence he can do nothing which injuriously affects his own position without injury to the country he represents for the time being. If this be so, and no intelligent man will deny it, then it is my duty to report to the Department all the circumstances connected with a pending difficulty between the British Minister and myself.

England is represented at this Court by W. D. Christie, formerly private secretary to Earl Minto, whose daughter is Lady Russell, wife of Earl Russell, the present Minister of Foreign Affairs. He was Minister to the Argentine Confederation in 1858, when, from his propensity to be in hot water, and his hatred of the United States and all its people, he wantonly quarrelled with our Consul, William Holley Hudson, refused to fight him, and when Hudson threatened personal chastisement (which he certainly should have inflicted), Christie appealed to the Government for protection. The correspondence was published, and I forward a copy, marked No. 1.

Mr. Christie was transferred to this Court as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary two years and a half ago; and within the first twelve months he had quarrelled with all his secretaries, household servants, and countrymen, besides his colleagues, the Pope's Internuncio, and the Ministers of Russia, Prussia, Austria, Spain, Belgium, Portugal, and Montevideo. His secretaries (there at three attached to his Legation), were changed, and he (Mr. Christie) furloughed and called home to explain. When I was in London, Christie was in England; and on the day I spent at Pembroke Lodge with Earl and Lady Russell, his lordship informed me that Christie must return to Rio.

I arrived here on the 4th of October, and the same steamer brought a letter from Earl Russell to the English Chargé, to be read to the Nuncio and Ministers of Russia, Prussia, Austria, and Spain, &c., apologizing for Mr. Christie's conduct, and asking them to forgive and receive him. They could not do otherwise; and upon his arrival four months thereafter, they received him most kindly. They said to me, however, "This peace cannot last; he will quarrel again with us, and also with you, and you must be prepared for it." They were right. At my table, at my first formal diplomatic dinner, he insulted first the French and then the Austrian Minister, and subsequently apologized for so doing.

I have already explained to you in a private letter that I spent a week in Mr. Christie's house in Rio (he spends four months in the city); and it now becomes my duty to report under what circum-

stances. At the French Minister's dinner, on the birthday of Napoleon III., Mr. Christie said to me, "I understand you intend to bring Mrs. Webb and your niece to the city with you on the anniversary of the Independence of Brazil, and if so I beg that you will come and spend a week with us" [himself and daughter]. I replied that I could make no engagement for Mrs. Webb, but would submit the proposition to her. He is a very peculiar, ill-mannered, rough man, and replied, "That is all nonsense. You do not want to come to me; if you did, you would say so at once. What do you or I care for our wives objecting in such a case, *intended to show the good feeling which exists between our countries!*" I responded, laughingly, that I did care a great deal for what my wife said in such a case, and *dared* not make an engagement for her. As for myself, if I came down alone, I should certainly go directly to his house; but as Mrs. Webb intended to come, all I could do was to submit the invitation to her. He then said, "There's an end of it; you will compel her to decline, and thus get rid of the visit by throwing the responsibility upon her." This annoyed me, and I remarked that I was not accustomed to any such duplicity, that I should submit his invitation to Mrs. Webb and my niece, and report to him their decision. To this he replied—"Pledge me your word, then, that you will not try to dissuade Mrs. Webb from accepting my invitation." I gave the promise. When I returned to Petropolis, the Prussian Minister, M. d'Eichmann, came with me as my guest; and, on sitting down to dinner, I related to Mrs. Webb, in his presence, precisely what had passed between Mr. Christie and myself, and called upon her then and there to make and announce her decision, in order that M. d'Eichmann might bear witness that I had not interfered to prevent the acceptance of Mr. Christie's invitation. Mrs. Webb promptly decided that she would *not* accept the invitation, and gave good and satisfactory reasons for declining. When we retired, I took up the case seriously, and urged her to reverse the decision for public reasons: that Christie was peculiarly and awkwardly situated in relation to his colleagues; and doubtless it would be considered by Earl Russell a favourable indication in regard to his future course, if he could report that the American Minister and his family were spending a week with the British Minister. On the following day came a pressing formal letter of invitation to Mrs. Webb, which I accepted, giving him notice that in three weeks from that time we should pay him a visit for one week; and I subsequently wrote to him, that in consequence of a previous engagement I must dine with the *Austrian* Minister on the day after our arrival, who would doubtless expect him and his daughter to do the same. At all events I was committed, and that he

must take me with my engagements. This letter required no reply, and received none.

On our arrival at Rio on the 5th of September, the Austrian Minister met us at the boat, claimed the fulfilment of our promise, and declared his intention to go direct to Mr. Christie's and invite him and his daughter to meet us at dinner the following day. We occupied an hour or two in shopping, and drove to Mr. Christie's, when on sitting down to lunch he informed me that Mr. Sonnleithner, the Austrian Minister, had been with him and *had released me from my engagement to dine with him next day*, and he, Mr. Christie, had invited others to dine with him! I said this was extraordinary, as the Austrian Minister had reported to me that he had already invited the French Minister and four other members of the Diplomatic Corps to meet us at his table; but of course I could not object.

I supposed all was right; but after lunch, Mrs. Webb suggested I had better go and see Sonnleithner, the Austrian Minister, on the subject. I did so; and he pronounced the whole story the greatest *misconception* conceivable, or a downright *falsehood*. He *had not* released me, but had, after his interview with Mr. Christie, extended his invitations, and announced that Mr. Christie and daughter, as well as my family, were to dine with him!

I caused him to write me a note to this effect, and in response I said I should dine with *him* as arranged. These notes I handed to Mr. Christie on my return. A scene ensued; and I informed him that if the matter was not arranged that evening I should not sleep under his roof—that he was treating us most inhospitably and rudely; and were it not that I desired to avoid the publicity of an open quarrel, I should quit his house on the instant. Mrs. Webb was present, and he made the most ridiculous appeals to me not to ruin him here and at home, and informed me that Earl Russell had urged upon him not to have any difficulty with me, but to cultivate the most cordial relations, and my leaving his roof under such circumstances would ruin him; and he entreated that I would stand by him, and let him give the “Austrian blackguard a lesson!” I said I had nothing to do with his quarrels—I was the conservator of my own honour; and having engaged to dine with Sonnleithner, I should do so, notwithstanding he, Mr. Christie, had invited the British Admiral and a large party to meet me at dinner.

After dinner he made another appeal, which I cut short by leaving the house, and stating that if on my return he did not satisfactorily arrange the difficulty with the Austrian Minister, I should be compelled to leave his house that evening. I drove to the Prussian Minister's, where I knew that the Pope's Inter-

nuncio and the Austrian Minister were dining, related all that had passed, and my determination to quit Mr. Christie's house unless he did what was right. It was finally agreed that the Prussian and Austrian Ministers should return with me, and that Mr. d'Eichmann should say to Mr. Christie that the Austrian Minister would waive his right to the dinner next day, *provided* Mr. Christie and daughter would dine at his house with us on the following Wednesday; if not, then I should at once remove my family to the Prussian Minister's. Mr. Christie assented, and there was peace. But it was rather an armed armistice. The old feud had broken out and raged as violently as ever, and I stood aloof. On the day my visit terminated I returned home, and a more uncomfortable visit was never made. I then offered my house as a home for Mr. Christie and his daughter while theirs was being got ready, and it was accepted. But circumstances rendered their coming to us unnecessary. On the surface, things have gone smoothly for a month past; but it was evident, from trifling and yet very annoying occurrences, that he was feeling very bitter to me and mine; and the character of the disastrous news from home gave him opportunities of making sneering remarks which were very vexatious at the same time that they could not be noticed. On three different occasions he was absolutely rude; and yet I bore it all philosophically, satisfied that he would continue to presume on my forbearance until prompt action would become a duty. Among the annoyances practised was an order to his two secretaries here, the chief being in Rio, prohibiting their attending the church service at this Legation, which I read regularly on Sundays; his inviting my guests to dinner without inviting us, &c. &c. &c.

On Thursday evening last, the 30th October, at M. de Glinka's, the Russian Minister's, in presence of the Russian and Prussian Ministers and the Russian Secretary of Legation, his conduct became unbearable, and I *ordered* him "never again to indulge in any similar language towards me; that it was impertinence, and my custom was to punish impertinence; a bad custom, perhaps, but nevertheless a habit; and by the God that made him and me, if he ever again dared, by word or look, to practise his impertinence towards me, I should punish him on the spot."

There was no response, but the most profound silence from all. After a proper interval I withdrew. A consultation was then held, and the Russian and Prussian Ministers came to me, and said the matter was placed in their hands; that an apology or a meeting the next day was inevitable, and that Mr. Christie had announced his determination to call me out at once unless the matter was promptly arranged; that I knew they were *my*

friends, and not the special friends of Mr. Christie, and rather intimated than asked that, in imitation of Mr. Christie, I should place the matter in their hands and abide by their decision.

I acknowledged and recognized their uniform kindness and friendship, but declined doing as they wished; assuring them that in all my difficulties—and I had been three times in the field, the last time with one whom I did not know even by sight, and whose voice I had never heard but once—I never had, and I never could, place my honour in anybody's keeping; that I should never again engage in a mere personal affair; but as the representative of my country I was bound to uphold her dignity even with my life, quite as much as I would be bound, if at home, to expose my life in putting down rebellion; that therefore I was prepared to say at once, that "Mr. Christie, if he desires it, shall have a meeting at sunrise; and to save all negotiation upon the subject, and prevent any useless propositions being made to me, I may as well say at once that I'll not apologize, or retract one word, until Mr. Christie first withdraws his offensive language, expresses regret for it, and declares that he did not intend to offend."

After a considerable time the two Ministers came to me again, and said, "We are authorized by Mr. Christie to say that when he used the language to which you took exception, he did not intend to offend, regrets its use, and withdraws it."

I thereupon went to Mr. Christie, and in the presence of M. de Glinka and M. d'Eichmann, said, "I learn from these gentlemen that you have authorized them to say that when you used the language to which I took exception, you did not intend to give offence; and that you regret and withdraw it. *You make me very happy by your declaration*; and it affords me pleasure at once to withdraw all I said, and to offer you my hand, burying the past in oblivion."

Sir, as you well know, I have long since determined never again to be engaged in a personal duel. When General Quitman brought me a challenge from Mr. Brooks, in consequence of what one of my associates had said upon his assault upon Senator Sumner, I said—"Withdraw it until to-morrow, when you will have in the *Courier and Enquirer*, my version of this affair, under my own signature; then come with your challenge, and I'll promptly accept it. Do not suppose that my religion stands in the way of my giving him the meeting he desires. You and I both recognise the duty of every Christian to shoulder his musket in defence of his country, and it is doubly his duty to defend the principles upon which our Government is based. Liberty of speech and entire freedom in debate are placed in jeopardy by this assault upon Mr. Sumner; and to uphold and defend those

great principles of the Constitution and my right to advocate them, I will give Mr. Brooks the meeting he asks. With him I have no quarrel; I bear him no ill-will. But freedom of speech, the sanctity of the floor of the Senate, and all the great principles upon which our Government is based, are assailed; and I recognise the duty of every citizen to vindicate them with their lives if need be, as even more imperative than my duty to resist invasion from a foreign enemy." The challenge was withdrawn and never revived. A knowledge of this anecdote would probably have rendered the British Minister more discreet, and saved him from disgrace.

The affair having been amicably arranged, *quite as much to my satisfaction as his*, we all agreed that henceforward all recollection of any disturbing circumstances should be forgotten; and in consequence I at once reported to Mrs. Webb that *our previous determination* never again to go to Christie's house, in consequence of his sneering and rudeness, must be abandoned, and our former friendly intercourse be resumed. But while I was thus acting in good faith, the benefits of which I am now reaping, Christie, feeling his disgrace, was meditating revenge and a disregard of the terms of settlement. He accordingly *ordered* the Hon. Mr. North to walk home with him and his daughter, instead of accompanying *us*, as he had engaged to do. It appears that before they had proceeded a hundred yards, he forbid North from continuing his intimacy at our house, and abused me as "No gentleman," &c. &c. North pointedly and peremptorily refused to obey him or recognise his right to interfere with his social relations, and they quarrelled and separated. The next morning Christie sent for North, and demanded an apology and a change of his relations with us. North refused either to apologize for what he had said or to change his relations with us; whereupon Christie withdrew an invitation already given to North to dine with him that day, and forbid all further personal intercourse with himself. The first I knew of all this was an application from Mr. North to be permitted to dine with me, who had invited the Russian Minister and family, and Mr. and Mrs. Biddle, to dinner.

Of course I was annoyed at hearing of this conduct of Christie; and when, on the following Tuesday evening, Mr. Brodie, an Attaché recently arrived from Washington, who claims to know you well, and who, if you know him at all, you must know to be a very trifling fellow, not only abstained from coming to Mrs. Webb's reception, but *said that it was to please Mr. Christie he stayed away*, I determined to give them both a lesson in regard to their duty and my social rights. Hence my call on Mr. Brodie the next morning, to inquire whether he abstained from coming

to me to please Mr. Christie, and to inform him that if he had abstained from Mr. Webb's receptions to please another, I should not permit him to come to please himself, as I did not recognise Mr. Christie's right to meddle with my affairs.

Now commenced a series of misrepresentations and *falsehoods* which can scarcely be credited, and which must result in both the English Minister and his second Secretary either withdrawing or being removed from Brazil.

Mr. Christie, as a man of his nature naturally would, turned from me, who was quite ready to quarrel with him, to his Attaché North, who was entirely in his power. And to protect Mr. North, and that Earl Russell might not be misled by *false* statements, I addressed him a despatch, together with copies of the correspondence. A copy of that document I send herewith, having appended to it Mr. Christie's last letter, which arrived after the English mail had left; and also a "summary" of the whole matter, prepared for the guidance of those members of the Diplomatic Corps who had not been cognizant of the affair from the beginning.

The last steamer, the eighth, took from here for England the Hon. Mr. Eliot, a son of Lord St. Germans, who accompanied the Prince of Wales to the United States. Mr. Christie had quarrelled with his Attaché Farquhar, and sent him away. He then quarrelled with Mr. Bailie, his Secretary of Legation, a brother-in-law of Lord Elgin, and Bailie refused to stay and asked to be relieved. Eliot arrived in March to relieve Bailie, who left without taking leave of Christie; and Malet, the Attaché, was relieved by Mr. North. Now, Eliot has sailed for home in the last packet, and North is *ordered* to go in the next!

A letter which I have seen, thus sums up Mr. Christie's doings in Brazil in two years and a half:—

"1st. He has had in his household, quarrelled with, and turned away, during that period, *forty-one domestics*.

"2nd. He has quarrelled with, and separated from, two secretaries of Legation, three attachés, one admiral, the flag-captain of the Fleet, the captain of the store-ship, and a majority of all the English he has come in contact with.

"3rd. He has quarrelled with the Internuncio of the Pope, and the Representatives of Russia, Prussia, Austria, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, and Montevideo. And finally,

"4th. He has now quarrelled with the Representative of the United States."

As this unpleasant affair has been finally disposed of by Mr. Christie's referring the whole matter to his Government, a course which I most heartily rejoice in, and as I have endeavoured to give my Government a faithful narrative of what has occurred

in the briefest manner possible, I have no more to say upon the subject. I venture to remark, however, that if there had been no rebellion at home, no *Trent* affair, and no bad blood existing between England and the United States, there would not have occurred any quarrel between their Representatives in this far distant quarter of the world.

"Nov. 17th, 1863.

"Mr. Christie, who has left here, and is living on board the English store-ship in the harbour of Rio, feeling the *peculiarity* of his position, denies the accuracy of my statement of our difficulty at M. de Glinka's, and has addressed a note to Messrs. de Glinka and d'Eichmann, the Russian and Prussian Ministers, asking a statement of the affair. They yesterday *replied*, that they had read my version of it as contained in my letter to Mr. Christie, and that they felt it their duty to say, that my statement, both of the difficulty and the manner and terms of settlement, was strictly accurate."

Published and circulated by MR. HUDSON.

Buenos Ayres, April 10th, 1858.

SIR,—I have the honour to submit herewith a copy of a correspondence growing out of an official visit—a visit simply of courtesy, made by me some weeks since to his Excellency W. D. Christie, H.B.M.'s Plenipotentiary near the Argentine Confederation.

On the occasion alluded to I called at the proper hour for such a visit, was informed that the Minister was in, and seeing him at the door of his saloon at the same moment, did not think it necessary to send in my card, as I could not but be well known to Mr. Christie, having been presented to him by the British admiral then on this station. I was received standing, with no request to be seated; and upon stating that I had called to pay my respects to the British Minister, received for reply: "I do not know you, sir, and I do not wish for the pleasure of your acquaintance." I answered, "I am much obliged to you, sir, but I wish you distinctly to understand that I have not called upon Mr. Christie, but on her Majesty's Minister." With a salutation, I left the house. Such unceremonious rudeness on the part of Mr. Christie was much commented on at the time, and I should be justly censurable were I to allow the matter to pass unnoticed.

Mr. Christie now finding himself pressed to make the *amende honorable*, and not possessing sufficient generosity so to do, professedly considering my letters as threatening, and apparently fearing a personal attack, makes a complaint to the Government of the State, that it may interfere for his protection.

Without other remark, I leave it to your judgment to decide how far Mr. Christie has been justified in bringing my name in such manner before the authorities of the country, and in withholding from me the satisfaction asked for.

I am, Sir, your very obedient servant.

Consulate of the United States of America,
Buenos Ayres, March 31st, 1858.

To his Excellency W. D. Christie,
H.B.M.'s Minister Plenipotentiary,
Near the Argentine Confederation,
&c. &c. &c.

The undersigned, Consul of the United States of America, presents his compliments to Her Majesty's Plenipotentiary, and having waited some weeks the opportunity of asking verbally an explanation of the manner in which he was received when calling officially on her Majesty's Minister, would now respectfully ask that Mr. Christie would favour him with such explanation as the circumstances would seem to demand, and which the undersigned most sincerely hopes will be of such a nature as will preclude the possibility of any unpleasant or disagreeable reference to the occurrence in future.

The undersigned avails himself of the occasion to say that he is entirely unaware of any private reasons, and much less official ones, which her Majesty's Minister may have had for the exercise of such marked discourtesy on the occasion alluded to, and subscribes himself with much consideration,

Your Excellency's very obedient servant,
(Signed) WM. HOLLEY HUDSON.

Buenos Ayres, March 31st, 1858.

Mr. Christie begs to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Hudson's letter of this day's date.

Mr. Christie not being accredited to the Government of Buenos Ayres, to which Mr. Hudson is accredited as Consul of the United States of America, had no reason to expect an official visit from Mr. Hudson; and as he does not remember that Mr. Hudson called upon him during a former period of six months which he passed in Buenos Ayres last year, he supposes that Mr.

Hudson has been also of opinion that he was not required to pay Mr. Christie an official visit.

Mr. Christie has the right to choose his acquaintance, and when a person whom he does not desire to know enters his room unannounced, there is nothing left for him but to say that he does not desire to know him. In frankly repeating this to Mr. Hudson, it cannot be necessary for Mr. Christie to disclaim disrespect for the nation of which Mr. Hudson is a citizen and the Consul at Buenos Ayres.

113, Reconquista, Buenos Ayres,
April 3rd, 1858.

Mr. Hudson has the honour to acknowledge Mr. Christie's note of 31st ult., in reply to his official letter of same date.

Mr. Hudson's official visit to Mr. Christie was one simply of courtesy and respect for the position held by him, though not accredited as Minister to the Government of Buenos Ayres. This visit Mr. Hudson felt it his duty to pay, he being the only representative of the United States at present or at that time in Buenos Ayres. Such was not the case when Mr. Christie made his former visit to this place, there being at that period a Minister Resident of the United States residing here, who paid Mr. Christie the usual visit of courtesy.

Mr. Hudson does not question Mr. Christie's right to choose his own acquaintance, but he does most explicitly deny the right of Mr. Christie, or any one else, to treat with indignity under his own roof any gentleman, however unwelcome as a visitor he may be.

Mr. Hudson is glad to find from Mr. Christie's note that the matter was purely a personal one, though Mr. Christie's frankness does not allow him to descend to explanations. The insult, then, falling simply upon Mr. Hudson, he will know how to resent it when the proper occasion offers.

Buenos Ayres, April 3rd, 1858.

SIR,—I have received your note of this day's date, which concludes with these words: "The insult, then, falling simply upon Mr. Hudson, he will know how to resent it when the proper occasion offers."

Nearly four months have passed since the occurrence of the incident out of which this correspondence arises; you have had much time for reflection, and I presume that the above words have not been written inconsiderately, and that they are not a mere idle menace.

I desire neither the distinction of a *fracas* with you nor to give unnecessary trouble to the authorities of Buenos Ayres.

My respect for the nation which you represent as a Consul will lead me to give faith to a clear assurance of the Consul of the United States of America that you do not intend to subject me to any personal annoyance.

If by twelve o'clock to-morrow (Sunday) I have not received from you a distinct and satisfactory assurance to this effect in writing, I shall then immediately take the proper steps for protecting myself against the possibility of further annoyance from
y. u.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,
(Signed) W. D. CHRISTIE.

W. H. Hudson, Esq.

Buenos Ayres, April 4th, 1858.

W. D. CHRISTIE, Esq., &c.

SIR,—I received your note of yesterday's date. You choose to construe a portion of my note of same date, as quoted by you, as a "menace," and threaten an application to the authorities of Buenos Ayres for your protection. Allow me to suggest that a simple written apology for the insult offered me in your own house would relieve you from all apprehension which my note may have occasioned, and also from any necessity, which in your opinion may exist, for applying to the authorities.

As your note of 31st ult. clearly makes this a personal matter, it would be manifestly improper that the Consul of the United States of America should give any assurances or take any part in it.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your very obedient servant,
(Signed) WM. HOLLEY HUDSON.

In consequence of the above, the gentleman applied for protection to the Government, who requested the Chief of Police to call on the writer and ask for assurances that he meant no personal attack, which the writer refused to give, or any other assurance whatever.

All the letters which follow have been heretofore published by Mr. Christie's countrymen in Rio, without the sanction or knowledge of Gen. Webb, who has published nothing, and who is responsible only for having furnished Mr. Moore the extract to Mr. Seward in relation to his difficulty with Mr. Christie.

Legation of the United States,
Petrópolis (Brazil), Nov. 7th, 1862,
2 o'clock A.M.

To the Right Hon. the Earl RUSSELL,
H. B. M. Secretary of Foreign Affairs, &c.

MY LORD,—Circumstances entirely beyond my control appear to render it imperative upon me, in defence of a most amiable young gentleman, an Attaché of the British Legation at this Court, to bring to the notice of your lordship a difficulty between H.M. Minister and myself. Mr. Christie, not content with quarrelling with the representatives of Russia, Austria, Prussia, and Spain, and the Internuncio of the Pope, has deemed it expedient, or at least convenient, to fasten a quarrel upon me. This does not surprise those who know him best; and it should not surprise your lordship when I relate a single incident, known to every one of the Diplomatic Corps except the party most interested—the Austrian Minister, M. Sonnleithner.

Mrs. Webb has receptions every Tuesday evening. The coaches from Rio arrive at six P.M. On Tuesday evening, the 28th October, the Prussian Minister and his wife, and Mr. Sonnleithner, came up from Rio, and just before our reception hour I went to their hotel to bring them to my house. Not being quite ready to join us, I returned, and found assembled in our *salon*, Mr. Christie and his family, and all our guests except M. de Glinka and his daughter, to whom I announced the fact of the arrival of M. and Madame d'Eichmann and Mr. Sonnleithner, who would shortly join us. Mr. Christie immediately inquired publicly of Mrs. Webb, "Can you inform me whether Mr. Sonnleithner comes up as Austrian Minister or as an Attaché of the Prussian Legation?" Mrs. Webb promptly and emphatically said, "Mr. Christie, we only know Mr. Sonnleithner as the Austrian Minister." I will not comment upon the manner in which this most gratuitous sneer at a colleague was received; but the kind feelings of all, and a sincere desire to preserve the peace of our small diplomatic circle, prevented its being repeated to Mr. Sonnleithner, who, up to this time, has not been advised of it.

Of the merits of my controversy with Mr. Christie it is no part of my purpose to speak—that is a matter between Mr. Christie and me, and between me and my Government. But Mr. Frederick H. North, one of your Attachés, has drawn down upon him the enmity and persecution of Mr. Christie for simply refusing, as any gentleman naturally would, to permit his Minister to control his social intercourse. The alternative has been distinctly presented to him of taking part in Mr. Christie's quarrel, or of consenting to a suspension of all personal intercourse. This alternative was formally presented by Mr. Christie on the morn-

ing of Friday last, when Mr. North had been invited to dine at the British Legation to meet M. and Madame d'Eichmann and Mr. Sonnenbuer; and Mr. North, preferring his independence as a gentleman to Mr. Christie's friendship on the terms presented, has not since been in his house; and even when informed through Mr. Biddle to-day (as will appear by his letter to Mr. Christie) that if he called with my letter he would be received, he was refused access to him.

When Mr. Brodie, in Mr. Christie's name, on Tuesday last, was urging Mr. North not to visit us, but send us an excuse that he was employed in copying despatches for the mail, and Mr. North said that was not true, Mr. Brodie proposed to remedy that by giving him more work than he could possibly perform. Mr. North declined being a party to the arrangement; but Mr. Brodie produced an amount of work from Mr. Christie which it was physically impossible for Mr. North to do within the time prescribed, but which he promised to labour at till too much fatigued to continue the work!

Mr. Christie possesses the legal right—or at least, from position, the power—to render his persecution of Mr. North, in his feeble state of health, exceedingly uncomfortable; and from his well-known antecedents, and his total disregard of truth and all gentlemanly qualities, as evinced in the correspondence enclosed, I cannot doubt what his course will be. Hence my troubling your lordship with this communication.

I did hope, as my note to Mr. Brodie last evening demonstrates, that Mr. Christie might have seen and admitted the propriety of not troubling your lordship, by this packet at least, with any communication on the subject. Indeed he was bound, as a man of honour, by Mr. Brodie's request, and my assent, that the matter should lie over. But having no faith in his acting as a gentleman would have done, at an early hour this morning, or rather yesterday, Thursday, it now being Friday, two A.M., I addressed a note to Mr. North—a copy of which you will find enclosed—urging him to procure Mr. Christie's approval of the arrangement made by me with Mr. Brodie. Upon Mr. Biddle's going to Mr. Christie's with my note (Mr. North having been ordered *not* to call at his house), he, Mr. Christie, refused to receive a note addressed to Mr. North except from Mr. North himself or Mr. Brodie. Mr. North thereupon promptly called upon Mr. Christie, and was refused admission! He then sent the note by his servant, who, after having been told truly that Mr. Christie was in his room, and waiting half an hour for an answer, was then told that Mr. Christie was *not* in, and that he need not wait. Mr. North then directed his servant to go to Mr. Christie's, and to remain there until he received an answer to his note, together

with the enclosure. At seven o'clock P.M., and not till then, he was handed the note from Mr. Brodie; but the enclosed note, of which Mr. Christie doubtless supposed there was no copy, he most ungentlemanly retained, and up to this hour he has not condescended to apprise Mr. North or me of his intentions, but improperly retains possession of my note to Mr. North.

Conduct like this requires no other comment than a simple statement of the fact.

Mr. North's note to me will explain the circumstances under which he communicated the reckless manner in which Mr. Christie repudiated and disregarded the terms of our settlement, and the obligations mutually imposed by our agreement, that the past should be buried in oblivion; and my note to Mr. North detailing my interview with Mr. Brodie, and Mr. Christie's note to me, together with all the circumstances of the case, go to show a reckless disregard of truth on the part of Mr. Christie, which is not characteristic of a gentleman, and certainly not commendable in a representative of the English nation.

My letter to Mr. Christie explains sufficiently the nature of our difficulty, the terms upon which it was arranged, and the obligations thereby mutually imposed. Everything relating thereto is, however, personal to myself, and will doubtless in due time work itself out to a legitimate conclusion.

I therefore close this long communication with the expression of my sincere regret that it has been necessary to trouble your lordship on such a subject; and in a well-founded conviction that strict justice will be done to all, based upon my sincere admiration of your private character, and my profound respect for your talents and justice as a statesman, I cheerfully submit the case of Mr. North to the consideration which it is entitled to receive at your hands.

(Signed)

J. WATSON WEBB.
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister
Plenipotentiary from the
United States to Brazil.

GENERAL WEBB to MR. NORTH.

Petropolis, Nov. 5th, 1862.

MY DEAR NORTH,—I have just terminated a very satisfactory interview with Mr. Brodie. He assures me that he did *not* abstain from coming to my house last evening at the request or intimation of Mr. Christie; but, on the contrary, Mr. Christie was extremely desirous that he should come! and so told him in presence of Sir Henry Huntly, and that he was prevented solely by the pressure of business, growing out of the fact that Sir

Henry is here without his commission. He said further, that Mr. Christie had never, directly or indirectly, intimated a desire that he should not be on the most friendly relations with us, and that he had *no knowledge* of, or any reason to believe, that he (Mr. C.) had requested that any other party should not visit us either last evening or on any other occasion! or that he had, directly or indirectly, intimated such a desire. Certainly, Mr. Christie had never requested him to make any such request or intimation to any person whatever. And further, that he had reason to know that Mr. Christie not only regretted that he (Mr. Brodie) was prevented by business from coming to us last night, but would have come to us himself if his health had permitted; that Mr. Christie had not been out of his bed since the evening at Dr. Mackenzie's.

I told him this was all satisfactory, and relieved me from a disagreeable duty; because, if he had ever abstained from coming to my house at Mr. Christie's request or order, self-respect demanded from me the declaration that any person thus acting should not visit us. And therefore, had my suspicions been correct, and had he admitted that he was absent to please Mr. Christie, it would have been my disagreeable duty to have forbid his visiting us in future.

(Signed)

Yours very truly,

J. WATSON WEBB.

Postscript.—I have great hesitation in asking you to do or say anything which might possibly place you in a position antagonistic to your chief; and yet, in consequence of that chief's proceedings since Thursday night, I feel it a duty I owe alike to my family and my official position, to put to you all the questions I asked of Mr. Brodie; and in the hope that you may answer them in an equally satisfactory manner,

I remain, your friend,

(Signed)

J. WATSON WEBB.

MR. NORTH to GENERAL WEBB.

Petropolis, Nov. 5th, 1862.

MY DEAR GENERAL WEBB,—In reply to your letter of the 5th, I have to state as follows:—

On Mr. Brodie's arrival at my house on that day, I showed him your letter. I then read it to him, and asked him *how* I could answer you in a manner similar to what I had told you, seeing that he had told me that Mr. Christie particularly desired me not to visit you on last evening. He answered that you had misunderstood what he had said to you, and that he should send

you a written explanation. I said he had better do so. I then told him, on his inquiry, that I had told you that *Mr. Christie had desired me not to come to you on the Tuesday evening.*

I informed you of my breach with Mr. Christie, which took place on our way home from the Russian Minister's; and also that he had virtually *ordered* me to walk home with him, as a reason satisfactory to myself, and which should seem sufficient to Mrs. and Miss Webb and yourself, on breaking my engagement to walk home with you.

Mr. Brodie well knew that, on the evening in question, Mr. Christie had desired that I should keep aloof from you, *for I told him so.*

I am yours most sincerely,

(Signed)

F. H. NORTH.

MR. BRODIE to GENERAL WEBB.

Petropolis, Nov. 5th, 1862.

MY DEAR SIR,—You made a series of communications to me this morning about my chief, which you *forbid* me to make known to him. I have reflected, and it is impossible for me to regard your inhibition.

My duty requires me to make known to my chief what you have said. But Mr. Christie is now so unwell and occupied for the packet, that I shall abstain from mentioning anything to him till after the mail has been despatched, and I hope under these circumstances you will think it right to defer your letters to Lord Russell and Mr. Seward till the next packet.

I am sure I sincerely trust that such a delay, by giving time for the influences of old good feelings to reassert themselves, may remove present unhappy misunderstandings, as I am certain they might be removed by frank explanations and the intervention of some mutually respected friend.

I hope you will let me know whether you will delay your letters or not, as in the event of your writing by this mail, *I shall feel it to be my duty to make a report to Lord Russell myself, without informing Mr. Christie for the present.*

Believe me, my dear Sir, yours faithfully,

(Signed)

WILLIAM BRODIE.

GENERAL WEBB to MR. BRODIE.

Legation of the United States, Petropolis, Nov. 5th, 1862.

MY DEAR SIR,—I cannot account for your misconception in saying that I forbade your reporting to your chief what passed

at our interview this morning. Every word that I uttered up to what was the legitimate end of that interview, *was just as much intended for him as for you*; it being as much my purpose to let him know that he must not presume to meddle with my social affairs, as it was to apprise you that if you ever obtained from coming to my house to please another, *I should not permit you to come there to please yourself*.

You denied most emphatically ever having been requested or ordered not to visit us; and you equally denied that you had any knowledge of any other person having been requested or instructed, directly or indirectly, not to come to us, and I expressed my satisfaction at your replies.

In the course of our interview I expressed my regret that Mr. Christie had not felt, as I had, that after having shaken hands and declared that the past was buried in oblivion, both of us were bound to act as if we had always been friends; and I told you that, as Mrs. Webb and I have previously determined never again to enter his house, I immediately, upon settling the affair with Mr. Christie, informed Mrs. Webb that the past was to be forgotten, and that our future relations with Mr. Christie were to be of the most friendly character. I spoke only of the *past*, and said nothing of my *present* feelings towards Mr. Christie; and yet when I was leaving, you, *impudently* as it then appeared, but probably only very *indiscreetly*, said you would advise Mr. Christie of my very friendly feelings towards him, and all would be settled! I was indignant at this, as well I might be, and demanded how you *dared* to assume that I wished any kind feelings expressed towards Mr. Christie, or desired any negotiations to be opened between us. I then explained how widely different are my feelings for him *now* from what they were when we shook hands, and would have been *now* if he had not violated our mutual pledge that the past was buried in oblivion; and I added, "If you want to deliver any *message* from me, let it be my contempt for one who, having settled a difficulty, violates the principles upon which it is settled by traducing his opponent." I paused, and said—"No, better say nothing of all this, as out of place, and consider our interview terminated where it did—better for peace that it should be so. I shall investigate what has taken place since our settlement at De Glinka's, and if I find I have done Mr. Christie injustice, I will call on him, frankly acknowledge my error, and ask his pardon."

Now, Sir, there was not then, nor is there now, any inhibition upon our reporting promptly everything that passed between us. *was designed for him as much as you*, except what passed in the last minute, in consequence of your *unauthorized* *activity*. I was seeking an explanation with Mr. Christie.

In a moment of excitement I sent him a *message*, and as promptly recalled it as uncalled-for and unnecessary; leaving it with you, then, as I do now, to act as you pleased.

I never spoke of a letter to Lord Russell. I told you that it was my duty (under general instructions) to report all difficulties with colleagues; and that I should of course make this matter the subject of a despatch to Mr. Seward, a copy of which I should forward to Earl Russell. My despatch to Mr. Seward will, I think, go forward by this mail; but it will be quite impossible to get ready a copy for Earl Russell—so nothing will go to him from me by this steamer.

Yours very respectfully,

(Signed)

J. WATSON WEBB.

MR. BRODIE to GENERAL WEBB.

Petropolis, Nov. 6th, 1862.

SIR,—On receipt of your letter yesterday evening, and finding Mr. Christie considerably better, I thought it best to communicate everything to him at once. Mr. Christie has desired me, in replying to you, to confine myself to telling you this.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Yours obediently,

(Signed)

WILLIAM BRODIE.

GENERAL WEBB to MR. NORTH.

Legation of the United States, Petropolis, Nov. 6th, 1862.

MY DEAR MR. NORTH,—You inform me that you yesterday told Mr. Brodie that you had communicated to me Mr. Christie's attempt on Thursday evening, on the way from De Glinka's, immediately after the settlement of our difficulty, to regulate your future visits to my house; and also of Mr. Brodie's having applied to you on Tuesday, in the name of Mr. Christie, not to attend Mrs. Webb's reception on that evening; and also that you had refused to acquiesce in these extraordinary and unreasonable demands, assuring both Mr. Christie and Mr. Brodie that while you were ready to respect and obey any and every order from Mr. Christie having reference to your official position or the interests of your country, you could not and would not permit him to control your social relations with the few families with whom you were on visiting terms.

Mr. Christie yesterday stated that he was apprized of your communication to Mr. Brodie, and intimated that he intended

to bring the subject before your Foreign Department by this steamer. In the meantime I have said to Mr. Brodie that I should make no communication to Earl Russell by this steamer. If I adhere to that arrangement, you would be liable to suffer from an *ex parte* statement. *This shall not be.* Therefore, send this note to Mr. Christie by a friend, or take it yourself, and say that if he intends to make any report to Earl Russell in relation to you, I desire to be informed of it, because in that event I should feel it my duty to lay aside all my public business, and devote myself entirely to giving the State Department an official account of everything that has occurred, a copy of which I will forward to Earl Russell, with full personal explanations, copies of Brodie's and Christie's letters, and my replies; and indeed all the correspondence on the subject, including a letter to Mr. Christie of this date which is now being copied.

Let me hear from you at once, as time is flying, and there must be no unnecessary delay.

I think it better for all parties, and certainly most convenient for me, that Mr. Christie should say to you, or your friend, that he will not allude to this subject in his despatches by the *Oncida*, and thus let the whole matter lie over till the next steamer.

Your friend,
J. WATSON WEBB.

(Signed)

MR. NORTH to MR. CHRISTIE.

Thursday.

To his Excellency W. D. CHRISTIE, &c.

SIR,—When I sent you the enclosed note from General Webb by Mr. Biddle, simply asking you what reply to make to it, your answer was, that you could not receive it except through a member of your Legation. I then called in person, and you refused to see me. I now enclose you the note, and request that you will return it to me by the bearer, informing me at the same time what answer I am to make General Webb.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,
(Signed) F. H. NORTH.

MR. BRODIE to MR. NORTH.

Petropolis, Nov. 6th, 1862.

SIR,—Mr. Christie desires me to say, in answer to your note, that you appear to have forgotten that when you called to-day at his house I told you from him that you could send in any message or document by me.

Mr. Christie has no instructions to give you as to an answer to General Webb. If he thinks it necessary that any answer should be given, he will answer the letter himself.

He wishes you, however, to be told, for your own information, that the following statement of General Webb is entirely without foundation—viz., “Mr. Christie yesterday stated that he was apprised of your communication to Mr. Brodie, and intimated that he intended to bring the subject before your Foreign Department by this steamer.”

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient humble servant,

(Signed)

WILLIAM BRODIE.

MR. CHRISTIE to GENERAL WEBB.

Thursday Morning, Nov. 6th, 1862.

SIR,—Mr. Brodie has informed me of a conversation which you had with him yesterday, and has shown me two letters which have passed between you.

It appears that you are indignant with me because you say that I have violated an engagement made after my acceptance of *your ample apology at Mr. Glinka's*, and that I have subsequently “traduced” you.

I should have thought that you would have given me an opportunity of contradicting such an imputation before giving it belief and speaking of it.

A few days ago, in your own house, you accused me, from hearsay or imagination, of an action which I should consider unfriendly and ungentlemanlike, making certain specific statements, every one of which was a fiction; and I immediately told you so, and destroyed your inconsiderate accusation.

I beg now again to tell you that in this instance you are completely in error; that I have not violated any engagement, and have not traduced you. I feel shame at finding it necessary to deny such an accusation made by one who holds the position of Minister of the United States, and I am astonished that you should have believed such a calumny, and reasserted it without inquiring of me.

It is, however, gratifying to me to see that you say, “If I have done Mr. Christie injustice, I will call on him, frankly acknowledge my error, and ask his pardon.”

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient humble servant,

(Signed)

W. D. CHRISTIE.

GENERAL WEBB to MR. CHRISTIE.

Legation of the United States, Petropolis,
Nov. 6th, 1862.

SIR,—Your letter of this date has just been placed in my possession. You say: "It appears that you are indignant with me because you say that I have violated an engagement made *after my acceptance of your ample apology at Mr. Glinka's.*"

I distinctly deny that anything of the kind "appears" in my letter to your Attaché, who assumed the direction of your affairs, until after the departure of the steamer on the plea of your being too ill to attend to them, although he well knew that you were preparing to entertain company to dinner at the time he wrote, and that you had invited additional guests during the day. He no sooner received my answer, however, than it was submitted to you, ill as you were! And it does not "appear" whether you had not *previously* seen his letter to me.

Neither in my reply to his extraordinary letter, constituting himself the guardian of your honour, and avowing the intention "*to make a report to Earl Russell myself, without informing Mr. Christie for the present,*" nor at any other time, or under any other circumstances, have I said or written anything which warrants your gratuitous and offensive assumption that I made to you an "*ample apology at Mr. Glinka's.*" But instead of disputing about terms, let the simple facts of the case speak for themselves.

At Mr. Glinka's, the Russian Minister's, on Thursday evening, October 30th, in the presence of the Russian and Prussian Ministers, the Russian Secretary of Legation, and at least *one* lady, you used towards me language far more befitting an English groom than an English Minister. I promptly declared it impertinence, said it was "my custom to punish impertinence—a bad custom, perhaps, but a *habit* upon which I had always acted; and, by the God that made me, if you ever again were impertinent to me, I should punish you."

To this you made no response, and after the lapse of some time I withdrew. You and Mr. Glinka and M. d'Eichmann then had a consultation in relation to what had passed, when they came to me and said the matter must be immediately arranged, or a meeting take place in the morning, and that you had agreed to challenge me unless it was arranged at once, and that you had placed the whole matter in their hands, &c. &c. &c.

I replied that, in regard to the meeting, I was ready to give it at *sunrise*, and in order to save unnecessary negotiation, I might as well inform them at once that under no conceivable circumstances would I make the slightest concession until you

had declared that, when you said what you did, you intended no offence, regretted having used the language, and withdrew it, when I should be most happy to *withdraw* my language. And I particularly requested that they would not come to me with any other proposition, as I certainly should not listen to it.

After an interval, the gentlemen returned to me and said: "We are authorized by Mr. Christie, who has placed this affair in our hands, to say to you, that when he used the expression at which you took exception, he had no intention to offend; that he regrets having used it, and withdraws it." I thereupon went directly to you, accompanied by the two gentlemen, and said: "I understand, Mr. Christie, from these gentlemen, that when you used the expression to which I took exception, you did not intend to give offence, and that you regret its use, and withdraw it. By so doing you make me happy; and I now most cheerfully withdraw every word or unkind expression which I used, and offer you my hand in reconciliation."

It is unnecessary to allude to some trifling discussions between you and our friends; but upon Mr. Glinka's expressing his gratification that *now* all would be peace again in our small diplomatic circle, I said that I, too, rejoiced most sincerely at this agreeable termination of an unpleasant occurrence, and that with me the past was buried in oblivion, never again to be thought of. You reiterated the sentiment, and we all returned to the house in good spirits at the happy termination of a very disagreeable affair.

Now, Sir, is this, or is it not, a correct history of what occurred, omitting some particulars which did not concern me? If it be, where, let me ask, do you find warrant for the *impudent* and gratuitous assumption that I made you "*an ample apology at Mr. Glinka's?*" If in your judgment this statement is not accurate, it becomes your duty to procure from Mr. Glinka and M. d'Eichmann their version of the case; and if their statement corresponds with mine, as it most assuredly will, I shall expect you to withdraw the offensive letter to which this is a reply, and which possibly should have been returned to you unanswered. And permit me here to apprise you that in all future correspondence between us, your letters must relate solely to the matter under discussion, and that you must not introduce new subjects extraneous to the question at issue.

Very respectfully your obedient servant,

(Signed)

J. WATSON WEBB.

MR. CHRISTIE to GENERAL WEBB.

[This note was sent to General Webb on Friday, the 7th of Nov., after the steamer's mail had gone forward.]

Petropolis, Nov. 6th, 1862.

SIR,—After receiving your letter of this afternoon I must decline further correspondence with you; and I refer the questions between us to my Government, and place myself under their orders.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient humble Servant,

(Signed)

W. D. CHRISTIE.

H. E. Gen. Webb.

The foregoing, with the exception of Mr. Christie's last letter, was sent to Earl Russell by the last steamer; and the following was appended to the copy of that despatch and documents circulated among the Diplomatic Corps at the Court of Brazil:—

SUMMARY.

The character of the difficulty between General Webb and Mr. Christie, and the conditions and manner of settlement, are all clearly set forth in General Webb's letter to Mr. Christie.

The accuracy of that statement is not questioned; and if not accurate, M. de Glinka and M. d'Eichmann, the Russian and Prussian Ministers, who arranged the affair, will feel themselves called upon to denounce it.

General Webb charges, that Mr. Christie violated the spirit of the settlement within an hour of its occurrence, by ordering his Attaché, Mr. North, to violate his engagement with General Webb's family, and then demanding from him a pledge to change his friendly personal relations with them. Mr. North refused obedience to his orders, a quarrel ensued, high words passed, and they separated.

On the following morning Mr. Christie sent his new Attaché, Mr. Brodie, to Mr. North, to urge upon him acquiescence in their chief's command. Mr. North refused to treat with the agent; was sent for by the principal, and an apology demanded, and acquiescence in the course prescribed towards General Webb's family insisted upon, as the only conditions upon which personal social intercourse with his chief would be permitted. Mr. North stood firm to his right, as a gentleman, to regulate his social intercourse as to him seemed proper; refused to apologize for having firmly insisted on his rights on the night previous, and took his leave of Mr. Christie. Since then he has not been admitted to his presence.

On Tuesday last, Mr. Christie sent Mr. Brodie to Mr. North, begging and entreating him not to attend Mrs. Webb's receptions, but come and dine with him under a promise of forgiveness. Mr. Brodie not only entreated and urged Mr. North to acquiesce, but suggested the plea of business, which he offered to make an apparently *truthful plea* by making the business.

Mr. Christie most pointedly and deliberately *denies* that he ever did anything of the kind! Mr. Brodie *denies* that he was ever thus employed, or that he knows, or has reason to believe, that Mr. Christie ever ordered, required, or desired any such conduct from Mr. North! To the astonishment of both, Mr. North boldly proclaims the fact, and deliberately commits it to paper. After first rebuking Mr. Brodie for his *disregard of the truth*, he says—

“Mr. Brodie *knew* that on the evening in question Mr. Christie had desired that I should keep aloof from you, *for I told him so!*”

Mr. North is now under punishment for daring to act independently, and for adhering to the simple *truth* without regard to its influence upon the respective reputations of Mr. Christie and Mr. Brodie. Not long since, Mr. Christie declared that a residence in Rio would be fatal to Mr. North, and that he should not stay there a week. It was then early in September. He is now, in the month of *November*, and when the hot weather has set in, *ordered* to take up his residence there, for ten days at least, to attend to public business! What business?

When Mr. Biddle was sent to Mr. Christie with General Webb's note to Mr. North, he was directed not to part with it, as it had not been copied. Mr. North subsequently took it with him when he waited on Mr. Christie, without having it copied, intending to retain possession of it. When, in consequence of Mr. Christie's having falsified his pledge to Mr. Biddle to receive Mr. North, it was determined to send the note by a servant, as the only mode of learning whether Mr. Christie intended to respect the arrangements made by his confidential agent, it was proposed to have the note copied, lest Mr. Christie, believing there was no copy, would retain possession of it. General Webb objected because it would involve a loss of time, and it was evident to him that Mr. Christie was manœuvring to consume time, and thus prevent his making a full communication to Earl Russell, if any. He suggested instead that Mr. Christie should be requested to return the letter enclosed with his decision, a request which, accompanied by an act of confidence in entrusting the paper to his *honour*, no *gentleman* would dare to disregard. This was agreed to; but the parties who knew Mr. Christie best, persisted in taking a copy of the enclosure.

The result justified their suspicions of what would be Mr. Christie's conduct. He not only refused to say whether he would or would not communicate with Earl Russell until after the steamer's mail had left Petropolis, but hoping there existed no copy of General Webb's letter to Mr. North, he retained possession of it, well knowing that he was bound in honour to return it unopened; and he still possesses that paper under circumstances so completely disgraceful to any person aspiring to the character of a gentleman. It is now fraudulently, if not feloniously, in his possession, and he has justified the most uncharitable estimate of his character.

Does not this gross violation of the ordinary proprieties of life justify the belief of many, that the man is insane?

If not, then arise the questions, is or is not this correspondence creditable to the English Minister? Do the facts disclosed tend to elevate him in the estimation of his colleagues? Has he thereby benefited his reputation as a man of peace, or his social position as a gentleman?

It is for his colleagues to determine.

J. W. W.

Postscript.—Mr. North has since been relieved from duty, and ordered by Mr. Christie to return to England by the first conveyance; and in the order sending him to England, Mr. Christie admits all that Mr. North charged, and punishes him for the "revelation" of what he chooses to declare the secrets of his Legation!—thus admitting that his previous denials to General Webb were deliberate untruths.

J. W. W.

N.B.—The Russian and Prussian Ministers, in reply to Mr. Christie, have fully and literally endorsed the accuracy of General Webb's letter to Mr. Christie.

J. W. W.

Legation of the United States, Petropolis,
Nov. 24th, 1862.

To his Excellency W. DONALD CHRISTIE, &c.

SIR,—An irresponsible and despotic head of a State may, in the mere wantonness of power, be guilty of acts of tyranny and oppression which, if perpetrated by one who is directly responsible to a just and intelligent superior, would be considered by all mankind conclusive evidence of insanity.

True, if the Emperor of Russia were to seize the letters of an humble American on their passage through his post-office, it would be denounced as tyranny, without calling in question his sanity; but if a postmaster in England, or in the United States,

were openly to perpetrate the same crime, and shamelessly proclaim his guilt, knowing as he would the certainty of prompt and severe punishment, it would constitute indisputable evidence of temporary insanity which no intelligent jury could resist.

Pending the existing advanced state of civilization in Great Britain and the United States, the slightest tampering with the sanctity of private correspondence, whether by official or private individuals, is deemed to be so great a crime against the spirit of the age, that he who is guilty of it, and recklessly avows his guilt, is of necessity termed a madman, because none other would avow himself guilty of a crime perpetrated not only against the law, but in violation of a leading principle of civilization whence the law emanates.

Of the truth of these well-settled convictions in the public mind, both in your country and in the United States, and indeed in any country claiming to be civilized, you are as well aware as I am; and yet you have recently been guilty of an act of tyranny and oppression, in connexion with a junior in your Legation, the perpetration of which is so directly at war with public opinion, the private rights of an individual, and the instincts of a gentleman, and so certain to be visited with severe and richly-merited punishment by your official superiors at home, as well as the indignation and contempt of your colleagues and acquaintances here, that in charity, as well as in accordance with the dictates of common sense, your act is very generally looked upon as that of a man temporarily insane. That it exhibits a gross defiance of well-settled public sentiment here and in England is clearly manifest; that it will call forth prompt and severe punishment from your Government, you cannot doubt; and that your conduct cannot fail to be looked upon by your colleagues of the Diplomatic Corps, and the public at large, as unbecoming the representative of the English Government, you are perfectly conscious; and yet you persevere in withholding from the Attaché of your Legation, the Hon. F. H. North, his private correspondence and newspapers, which came addressed to him by the French steamer on the 15th instant, and which were necessarily, as is the custom in all Legations, confided to the honour and consigned to the care of his Chief.

No matter what Mr. North's offence, there can be no justification of such a procedure. Had he been guilty of murder, convicted and sentenced to death in enlightened England, no official menial would have dared to exercise such despotic power over him, and the most the Government itself would have felt warranted in doing would have been, on suspicion of treason, to have opened and examined the letters addressed to the Hon.

deemed victim before transmitting to him whatever was not deemed dangerous to the State.

But Mr. North is guiltless of crime or offence of any kind, except in your excited imagination.

In the gratification of your well-recognised propensity to quarrel with your colleagues, your secretaries and attachés, and even your tradespeople and servants, you forced a quarrel upon me; thus adding the Representative of the United States to the long list of Foreign Ministers with whom you have quarrelled at this Court within the last two years—viz.: the Internuncio of the Pope, and the Ministers of Russia, Prussia, Austria, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, and Montevideo.

I got rid of that quarrel by apprising you that I had an ugly habit of punishing impertinence; and your withdrawal of the offensive language used was followed by our mutual declarations that the past should be buried in oblivion.

I acted in good faith; but within the hour you violated your pledge made to the Russian and Prussian Ministers, and personally abused me to your Attaché, and virtually prohibited his continuing his intimacy at my house. As a gentleman naturally would, he indignantly denied your right to control his social intercourse, and high words and a rupture followed. On the following morning you sent your other Attaché to induce Mr. North to apologize for his conduct, and promise acquiescence in your unreasonable demand, as the conditions of your forgiveness. He refused to treat with any other person than the principal; and you then personally demanded of him an apology for what had occurred the evening previous, and a promise to discontinue his visits to my house, as the only terms upon which you would continue personal relations with him. He refused your terms of settlement, and distinctly and deliberately told you they were such as no Minister *claiming to be a gentleman* would exact of a subordinate. Since then you have not met.

Subsequently you sent your agent to Mr. North, waiving the apology and offering "forgiveness" if he would only abstain from visiting my house.

All this you and your agent deliberately denied, in writing and verbally. But Mr. North certified to its truth; and I learn that you, Sir, *under your own signature*, charging him with making improper "revelations" of your opinions of your colleagues, have since virtually *admitted* the truth of what you had formally in writing *denied*!

To punish Mr. North for thus refusing to permit you to interfere with his social relations, you ordered him to repair to Rio for ten days, in the midst of the present hot weather, not doubting but it would prove highly injurious if not *fatal* to him;

because two months ago, when the weather was cool and Rio healthy, you said that Mr. North ought not to stay in Rio a single week in his present precarious state of health, as it might prove fatal to him!

Mr. North remonstrated against going to Rio, on account of his health, and quoted the opinion of his physician. Another difficulty ensued between you, and you ordered him to repair to England, and report himself to the Foreign Office. You next ordered him to sail in the French steamer, which leaves here to-morrow, when the sun is nearly vertical, and which would cause him to arrive in London about Christmas, in mid-winter! and that, too, in his present feeble state of health.

Sir, you do not, and cannot doubt, that such a change from extreme heat to an English winter would prove fatal to Mr. North. As you have been apprised by his correspondence, he dare not thus trifle with his health, but will probably report himself to the Foreign Office, and await here the decision of Earl Russell in regard to his conduct, well knowing that that nobleman will not countenance injustice.

In the meantime the French steamer from Bordeaux arrives on the 16th inst., and, as is customary in all Diplomatic services, more especially in this far-distant part of the globe, the private and family letters, as well as the public letters, newspapers, and reviews belonging to the Legations and Attachés of a Legation (and their families) all go to the Chief for distribution. Confidence is reposed in his honour, in his official character, and, if a gentleman, in his *natural instincts*, as the surest of all guarantees that the sanctity of private correspondence will be regarded, and the letters thus entrusted to the honour of one who represents his country at a foreign Court, will be safely and promptly delivered—a confidence which, I venture to assert, has never been misplaced in any service except in the present instance.

To you, Sir, belongs the enviable notoriety of inaugurating a proceeding utterly at war with the practices of the Corps of which you are a member, and not creditable to the Government which has placed you in your present honourable and exalted position. You received possession of Mr. North's private and public letters and papers on the 15th inst., but gave no notice of their being in your possession until on the 21st, and then only in answer to his letter inquiring whether you had not in your possession letters from his family and friends addressed to him. You informed him that they have been in your possession five days! but that it is no part of your purpose to deliver them to him, unless he sails for home in the French steamer to-morrow. If on board as a passenger, the letters will be placed in his hands; if not, they are to be returned to the Foreign Office in London, whence they were transmitted!

The simple fact of committing this outrage to paper forces upon me the conviction that it is an act of *insanity*.

There is not and cannot be any other apology for it. A knave might be guilty of destroying the letters, and then deny that they had ever come into his possession; none but a *madman* would plead guilty of withholding from the parties to whom they are addressed, letters confided to his custody. So monstrous an outrage could not be conceived by any person in full possession of their intellect; and I indulge the hope that in some sane interval you will reverse your most unwarrantable decision. The letters in your possession addressed to Mr. North were entrusted by his friends to the Foreign Office; and by it they have been forwarded to you, confiding in your honour to do your duty and promptly deliver them, regardless of your relations for the time being with Mr. North; and yet, because you have quarrelled with Mr. North, and almost every gentleman whom you know in Brazil, you refuse to deliver them!

Of course you are ignorant of their contents. They may, however, convey to him the afflictive intelligence of the death of his mother and other near and dear relatives; and yet because the writers have made the error of supposing that your official character was a guarantee for their faithful delivery, Mr. North is deprived of them! *Sane or insane*, is such conduct creditable to the Representative of the Government and people of England?

My Secretary of Legation, Mr. Biddle, has within a short period received intelligence of the death of his grandmother and brother, and of Mrs. Biddle's brother. Now, Sir, suppose that we had quarrelled—and we are only human—would that fact have justified me in withholding his letters unless he would sail for home at the time and in the vessel named by me? Would you, Sir, or any other member of the Diplomatic Corps, under such circumstances, have doubted my *insanity*?

And if *insane*, would not all parties, including my countrymen, have demanded my removal from a station the duties of which I was no longer capable of discharging? Nay, were such a contingency to arise, would not our Consul, under the countenance and advice of my countrymen in Rio, be justified in sending me home as a *lunatic*, on the ground that both my conduct and public opinion alike certified to my *insanity*?

As members of the Diplomatic Corps, you and I, and all our colleagues, are invested by international law with special privileges. Our domiciles are made for the time being a part of the soil of our respective countries, and our households are exempt from arrest, and virtually placed beyond the reach of the law, by having extended to us the rights and privileges of extra-territoriality. But this exemption and these privileges do not include

permission to commit great crimes against the law of the land in which we reside, nor do they extend to madmen, or to Ministers who, by their conduct, clearly demonstrate that they have become insane.

It is the duty of the local authorities, always and everywhere, to protect the people from the insane acts of a madman; and if Mr. North's countrymen in Brazil were to take the law in their own hand, and forcibly possess themselves of his property, now so improperly retained by you, I do not believe that the Brazilian Government would feel itself called upon to punish such a proceeding. Your act of oppression and outrage places you, in relation to the legitimate consequences of that act, beyond the protection afforded by privileges of extra-territoriality; and I doubt not, if Mr. North's health and strength permitted, he would ere this have tested the question.

Assuredly, if I had been guilty of such treatment of Mr. Biddle, the Secretary of this Legation, I should have considered my conduct as fully warranting his taking the law into his own hands; and on complaint to the authorities, I should have expected to have been told it was no more than the natural consequences of my own acts, and the legitimate fruits of my insanity.

Sir, I greatly regret the necessity of addressing you this Letter; and I can say, in all sincerity, that I have, under advisement, rendered it as temperate as the nature of the case admits.

But you must bear in mind that Mr. North has become involved in this difficulty with you, and been ordered out of the country at the risk of his life, and is now most shamefully deprived of his letters from his family and friends, solely because he would not gratify your wish that he should cease his intimacy with my family, and take part with you in a quarrel which had been amicably arranged, in terms to which, however honourable or humiliating to either of us, you had given your assent, and by which you were pledged to both the Russian and Prussian Ministers, acting as your friends, that the past should be buried in oblivion. You did not keep faith either with me or with them when you called upon Mr. North, who had been apprised of the terms and conditions of our settlement, to revive and take part in a past difficulty, by refusing to continue his intimacy with my family, because the conditions of settlement, approved by you, were not what you could have desired.

I am thus the innocent cause of Mr. North's present position, and responsible for the deprivations to which he is exposed. He was not directly or indirectly mixed up in our difficulty, and became involved, and is now the only sufferer from it, because he refused, as a gentleman should, to permit his official superior to interfere with his social affairs. Nobody has wronged you; but smarting

under your own settlement of an affair which you had forced on me such against my will, and feeling that I was beyond your reach, you sought to make your Attaché a party to your feelings, and failing, you are now wreaking upon him the wrath bottled up for my special benefit. Hence *it becomes my duty* to do all in my power to relieve Mr. North from the embarrassments of his position, and to protect him, as far as practicable, from the effects of your malice.

I therefore, by the last steamer, forwarded to Earl Russell all the facts of the case; and I now appeal to your more deliberate judgment for a revival of your decision in relation to Mr. North's letters, &c.

I hope this note may reach you when free from the malign influences under which you have been acting, and that you will, *within two hours of its receipt*, send to Mr. North his letters, &c. received by the last steamer.

In that case I shall rejoice at the termination of this new difficulty. If, however, you refuse to perform this act of tardy justice, *which it is my duty to Mr. North to demand*, I shall forward to Earl Russell to-morrow a copy of this letter, and also cause it to be published in Rio and London. Your obedient servant,

(Signed)

J. WATSON WEBB,

P.S.—It is due to Mr. North to say that this letter, written in no unfriendly spirit, is prepared and forwarded without his knowledge, from a sense of duty, and in the hope that it may awaken you to a sense of the odium which must necessarily follow perseverance in the illegal and most extraordinary course you are pursuing.

(Signed)

J. W. W.

The letters were not sent to Mr. North until after the steamer sailed, when this letter was added to the correspondence in circulation among the Diplomatic Corps, which at once compelled Mr. Christie to surrender to Mr. North his letters and papers.

While in Rio, a gentleman applied for permission to take a copy to send to Mr. Eliot in London, which was granted. In the meantime it was lithographed and circulated among Mr. Christie's countrymen; of which I knew nothing until my return from the river Plate, on the 25th January, 1863.

J. W. W.

THE END.